



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 34] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, अगस्त 23, 1975/भाद्र 1, 1897
No. 34] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1975/BHADRA 1, 1897

इस भाग में निम्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)
केंद्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए गए साधारण आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities
(other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

NOTICE

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were upto the 28th February 1975:—

Issue No.	No. and date	Issued by	Subject
1	2	3	4
46.	का०भा० 62(अ) दिनांक 1 फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 62(E), dated the 1st February 1975.	उद्योग और नागरिक वृत्ति मंत्रालय। Ministry of Industry & Civil Supplies	अधिसूचना संख्या का०नि०भा० 241 तारीख, 25 जनवरी, 1955 की विरुद्ध। Rescission of the Notification S.R.O. 241, dated the 25th January 1955.
	का०भा० 63(अ) दिनांक, 1 फरवरी 1975। S.O. 63(E), dated the 1st February 1975.	तदैव Do.	कोई व्यक्ति अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी भी वस्तु के विक्रय या क्रय के लिए अग्रिम संविदा नहीं करेगा। No person shall enter into forward contract for the sale or purchase of any of the goods specified in the Schedule.
	का०भा० 64 (अ) दिनांक 1 फरवरी 1975। S.O. 64 (E), dated the 1st February 1975.	तदैव Do.	अग्रिम संविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम 1952 की धारा 17 की उपधारा (1) और (2) के उपबन्ध की बाबत अनन्तरणीय विनिर्दिष्ट परिवहन संविदाओं को अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट वस्तुओं में लागू होना। Provisions of Sub-sections (1) and (2) of section 17 of the Forward contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 shall apply to non-transferable specific delivery contracts of the goods specified in the schedule.
	का०भा० 65 (अ) दिनांक 1 फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 65 (E), dated the 1st February 1975.	तदैव Do.	कोई व्यक्ति वस्तुओं के विक्रय या क्रय के लिये अनन्तरणीय विनिर्दिष्ट परिवहन संविदा ऐसी संविदाओं को छोड़कर जो विनिर्दिष्ट हैं, नहीं करेगी। No person shall enter into any non-transferable specific delivery contract for the sale or purchase of the goods in the whole of India except the classes specified therein.

1	2	3	4
का०भा० 66 (प्र) दिनांक, 1 फरवरी, 1975।	उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्तिमंत्रालय।	प्रथम संविदा (विलियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 17 की उपधारा (1) और (2) के उपबन्ध एरण्ड तेल की बाबत अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विनि-विष्ट परिवान संविदाओं को लागू होना।	
S.O. 66 (E), dated the 1st February 1975.	Ministry of Industry & Civil Supplies.	Provisions of sub-sections (1) and (2) of section 17 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 shall apply to non-transferable specific delivery contracts in respect of Castor oil.	
का०भा० 67 (प्र) दिनांक, 1 फरवरी, 1975।	तदैव	कोई व्यक्ति एरण्ड तेल के विक्रय या क्रय के लिये कोई अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विनिविष्ट परिवान संविदा, ऐसी संविदाओं जो विनिविष्ट हैं छोड़कर, नहीं करेगी।	
S.O. 67 (E), dated the 1st February, 1975.	Do.	No person shall enter into any non-transferable specific delivery contracts for the sale or purchase of castor oil except the classes of such contracts specified.	
47. का०भा० 68 (प्र) दिनांक, 1 फरवरी, 1975।	भारत निर्वाचन आयोग।	अमान्यता प्राप्त रजिस्ट्रीकृत राजनीतिक दल का नाम और वह राज्य/वे राज्य जिनमें यह दल कार्य करता है।	
S.O. 68 (E), dated the 1st February 1975.	Election Commission of India	Names of the Un-recognised registered political parties and the state or states in which they function.	
47क. का०भा० 68-ए (प्र) दिनांक, 3 फरवरी, 1975।	वाणिज्य मंत्रालय।	आयात (नियंत्रण) प्रथम संशोधन आदेश, 1975।	
S.O. 68A (E), dated the 3rd February 1975.	Ministry of Commerce	Imports (control) First Amendment Order, 1975.	
48. सा०नि० 69 (प्र) दिनांक, 4 फरवरी, 1975।	गृह मंत्रालय	प्रत्येक व्यक्ति की ड्यूटी जो छह मास के लिए मनीपुर से सेवारत होगा वह सक्रिय ड्यूटी होगी।	
S.O. 69 (E), dated the 4th February 1975.	Ministry of Home Affairs	The duty of every person serving in Manipur for a period of six months as active duty.	
सा०नि० 70 (ई) दिनांक, 4 फरवरी, 1975।	तदैव	प्रत्येक व्यक्ति की ड्यूटी जो छह मास के लिए महाराष्ट्र से सेवारत होगा वह सक्रिय ड्यूटी होगी।	
S.O. 70 (E), dated the 4th February 1975.	Do.	The duty of every person serving in Maharashtra for a period of six months as active duty.	
सा०नि० 71 (प्र) दिनांक, 4 फरवरी, 1975।	तदैव	प्रत्येक व्यक्ति की ड्यूटी जो छह मास के लिए मध्य प्रदेश से सेवारत होगा वह सक्रिय ड्यूटी होगी।	
S.O. 71 (E), dated the 4th February 1975.	Do.	The duty of every persons serving in Madhya Pradesh for a period of six months as active duty.	
का०भा० 72 (प्र) दिनांक, 4 फरवरी, 1975।	तदैव	प्रत्येक व्यक्ति की ड्यूटी जो छह मास के लिए मैसूर से सेवारत होगा वह सक्रिय ड्यूटी होगी।	
S.O. 72 (E), dated the 4th February 1975.	Do.	The duty of every person serving in Mysore for a period of six months as active duty.	
का०भा० 73 (प्र) दिनांक, 4 फरवरी, 1975।	तदैव	प्रत्येक व्यक्ति की ड्यूटी जो छह मास के लिए आंध्र प्रदेश से सेवारत होगा वह सक्रिय ड्यूटी होगी।	
S.O. 73 (E), dated the 4th February 1975.	Do.	The duty of every person serving in Andhra Pradesh for a period of six months as active duty.	
का०भा० 74 (प्र) दिनांक, 4 फरवरी, 1975।	तदैव	प्रत्येक व्यक्ति की ड्यूटी जो छह मास के लिए उत्तर प्रदेश से सेवारत होगा वह सक्रिय ड्यूटी होगी।	
S.O. 74 (E), dated the 4th February 1975.	Do.	The duty of every person serving in Uttar Pradesh for a period of six months as active duty.	
49. का०भा० 75 (प्र) दिनांक 4, फरवरी, 1975।	भारत निर्वाचन आयोग	दिल्ली संघ राज्य क्षेत्र में दिल्ली सदर और चांदनी चौक संसदीय निर्वाचन-क्षेत्रों के लिए निर्वाचक नामावलिमें में नाम सम्मिलित किए जाने के लिए बाबे या उसमें किसी प्रविष्टि पर आक्षेप वांछित के लिए 12 फरवरी, 1975 तक तारीख बढ़ाता है।	
S.O. 75 (E), dated the 4th February 1975.	Election Commission of India	12th February 1975 is the period within which a claim for the inclusion of a name or an objection to any entry in the electoral rolls for the Delhi Sadar and Chandni Chowk Parliamentary constituencies in the Union Territory of Delhi shall be lodged.	

50. कां० 76(घ) दिनांक, 4 फरवरी, कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय पशु चारे की किस्में।
1975।
S.O. 76 (E), dated the 4th Ministry of Agri. & Irrigation Varieties of cattle fodder.
February 1975.
51. कां० 77(घ) दिनांक, 4 फरवरी, भारत निर्वाचन आयोग हरियाणा राज्य के संसदीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्रों के रिटर्निंग आफिसर।
1975।
S.O. 77 (E), dated the 4th Election Commission of India Returning Officers of the Parliamentary constituencies in the
February 1975. State of Haryana.
- कां० 78(घ) दिनांक, 4 फरवरी, तदेव हरियाणा राज्य के संसदीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्रों के सहायक रिटर्निंग आफिसर।
1975।
S.O. 78 (E), dated the 4th Do. Assistant Returning officers of the Parliamentary constituencies
February, 1975. in the State of Haryana.
52. एस० 79(घ) दिनांक 5 फरवरी, वित्त मंत्रालय, भगवान महावीर के निर्वाण की 2500वीं जयन्ती की स्मृति में 24
1975। अप्रैल, 1975 को पूरे भारत में सार्वजनिक छुट्टी घोषित।
S.O. 79 (E), dated the 5th Ministry of Finance 24th April 1975 to be a public holiday throughout India in
February 1975. commemoration of the 2500th Anniversary of Lord Mahavir's
Nirvana.
53. कां० 80(घ) दिनांक, 5 फरवरी, भारत निर्वाचन आयोग मेघालय राज्य में जिला निर्वाचन आफिसरों का अधिकारिता का क्षेत्र।
1975।
S.O. 80 (E), dated the 5th Election Commission of India Area of jurisdiction of District Election officers in the State of
February 1975. Meghalaya.
54. कां० 81(घ) दिनांक, 5 फरवरी, विधि न्याय और कंपनी कार्य मंत्रालय मध्य प्रदेश में 22 जबलपुर संसदीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से लोक सभा के
1975। निर्वाचन।
S.O. 81 (E), dated the 5th Ministry of Law, Justice & Election to the House of the People from 22-Jabalpur Parlia-
February 1975. Company Affairs. mentary Constituency in Madhya Pradesh State.
55. कां० 82(घ) दिनांक, 6 फरवरी, भारत निर्वाचन आयोग दिल्ली संघ राज्य क्षेत्र में के बाह्य दिल्ली संसदीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्र के लिए
1975। निर्वाचक नामावतियों में नाम सम्मिलित किए जाने के लिए बाधे या
उसमें की किसी प्रविष्टि पर आक्षेप बाधित के लिए 14 फरवरी,
1975 तक तारीख बढ़ाता है।
S.O. 82 (E), dated the 6th Election Commission of India 14th February 1975 is the priod within which a claim for the
February 1975. inclusion of a name or an objection to any entry in the electoral
rolls for the Outer Delhi Parliamentary Constituency in the
Union Territory of Delhi, shall be lodged.
56. कां० 83(घ) दिनांक 6 फरवरी, भारत निर्वाचन आयोग अधिसूचना सं० 100/असम-लो० सं०/1/74 (घ) तारीख 31 जनवरी, 1975 में
1975। सुद्धियां।
S.O. 83 (E), dated the 6th Do. Corrigenda to Notification No. 100/AS-HP/1/74 (Bye) dated
February 1975. 31st January 1975.
57. कां० 84(घ) दिनांक, 7 फरवरी, तदेव सारणी के स्तम्भ 1 में विनिर्दिष्ट संसदीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्र के लिए सहायक
1975। रिटर्निंग आफिसरों की नियुक्ति।
S.O. 84 (E) dated the 7th Do. Appointment of Assistant Returning Officers for the Parlia-
February 1975. mentary Constituency specified in col. 1 of the table.
58. कां० 85(घ) दिनांक, 7 फरवरी, तदेव सारणी के स्तम्भ 1 में विनिर्दिष्ट हिमाचल प्रदेश के संसदीय निर्वाचन
1975। क्षेत्र के लिए हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार के आफिसरों को रिटर्निंग आफिसर
के रूप में पदाभिहीत।
S.O. 85 (E), dated the 7th Do. Himachal Pradesh Govt. officers designated as Returning
February 1975. officers for the constituencies of Himachal Pradesh specified
in col. 1 of the Table.
59. कां० 86(घ) दिनांक, 7 फरवरी, तदेव सारणी के स्तम्भ 1 विनिर्दिष्ट रिटर्निंग आफिसरों के सहायता के लिए
1975। हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार के आफिसरों को सहायक रिटर्निंग आफिसर के
रूप में नियुक्ति।
S.O. 86 (E), dated the 7th Do. Appointment of Himachal Pradesh Govt. officers as Assistant
February 1975. Returning officers for the assistance of Returning officers
specified in Col. 1 of the Table.

59. S.O. 87 (E), dated the 8th February 1975. Delimitation Commission of India. The State of Jammu & Kashmir shall be divided for the purpose of election to the House of the People and the extent of each constituency as shown in the Table.
60. कां०प्रा० 88(प्र) दिनांक 10 फरवरी, 1975। गृह मंत्रालय। अधिसूचना में उल्लिखित विषयों पर जांच करते के लिए भारत के उच्चतम न्यायालय के न्यायाधीश न्यायमति श्री के०के० सैथ्यू को एक माल सदस्य के रूप में जांच आयोग नियुक्ति करती है।
- S.O. 88 (E), dated the 10th February 1975. Ministry of Home Affairs. Appointing a Commission of Inquiry consisting of Shri Justice K.K. Mathew, Judge, Supreme Court of India in regard to matters mentioned therein.
61. कां०प्रा० 89 (प्र) दिनांक 11 फरवरी, 1975। वित्त मंत्रालय। केन्द्रीय सरकार की पूर्वानुमति के लिये बिना किसी सरकारी लिमिटेड कम्पनी द्वारा 1 जुलाई, 1975 से 31 जुलाई 1975 तक और 1 सितम्बर 1975 से 15 अक्टूबर 1975 तक की अवधियों के लिए 249 लाख रुपये की प्रतिभूतियों से अधिक मूल्य की प्रतिभूतियों के लिए न तो पेशकश की जायगी और न ही पेशकश की अवधि बालू रखी जायगी।
- S.O. 89 (E), dated the 11th February 1975. Ministry of Finance. During the calendar 1975 no offer of securities in excess of Rs. 249 lakhs by a Public limited co. shall be made or kept open during the periods from 1-7-75 to 31-7-75 and from 1-9-75 to 15-10-75 without obtaining the prior permission of the Central Government.
62. कां०प्रा० 90 (प्र) दिनांक 12 फरवरी, 1975। भारत निर्वाचन आयोग। दिल्ली संघ राज्यक्षेत्र में दिल्ली सदर और चांदनी चौक संसदीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्रों के लिए निर्वाचन नामावतियों के नाम सम्मिलित किए जाने के लिए बाधे या उसमें की किसी प्रविष्टि पर आक्षेप बाधिले के लिए 19 फरवरी 1975 तक तारीख बढ़ाता है।
- S.O. 90 (E), dated the 12th February 1975. Election Commission of India. 19th February 1975 is the period within which a claim for the inclusion of a name or an objection to any entry in the electoral rolls for the Delhi Sadar and Chandni Chowk parliamentary constituencies in the Union Territory of Delhi shall be lodged.
63. कां०प्रा० 91(प्र) दिनांक 12 फरवरी, 1975। वाणिज्य मंत्रालय। निर्वर्ति (निमंत्रण) पांचवां संशोधन आदेश, 1975।
- S.O. 91 (E), dated the 12th February, 1975. Ministry of Commerce. Exports (Control) Fifth Amendment Order, 1975.
64. कां०प्रा० 92 (प्र)/आई०डी०प्रा० ए०/75/1, दिनांक 12, फरवरी 1975। उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय। भूतपूर्व औद्योगिक विकास मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक विकास विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं०कां०प्रा० 98 (ई)/आई०डी०प्रा०ए०/29-ख/73/1, तारीख 16 फरवरी, 1973 में और संशोधन।
- S.O. 92 (E)/IDRA/75/1, dated the 12th February 1975. Ministry of Industry & Civil Supplies. Further amendment in the notification of the Govt. of India in the late Ministry of Industrial Development (Department of Industrial Development) No. S.O. 98 (E)/IDRA/29B/73/1, dated 16th February 1973.
65. कां०प्रा० 93(प्र) दिनांक 13 फरवरी, 1975। गृह मंत्रालय। समस्तीपुर में हुए विस्फोटों की घटनाओं और उनसे सम्बन्धित मामलों के विषय में जांच करने के लिए जांच आयोग (1975)।
- S.O. 93 (E), dated the 13th February 1975. Ministry of Home Affairs. Commission of Inquiry to inquire into the incidents of Explosions at Samastipur and matters connected therewith (1975).
66. कां०प्रा० 94 (प्र) दिनांक 14 फरवरी, 1975। वाणिज्य मंत्रालय। खादी तथा अन्य हथकरघा उद्योग विकास (रेयन तथा कृत्रिम रेशम के कपड़ों की कतिपय किस्मों पर प्रतिरिक्त उत्पाद शुल्क के संवाय से छूट) नियम, 1975।
- S.O. 94 (E), dated the 14th February 1975. Ministry of Commerce. Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development (Exemption from payment of Additional Excise Duty on certain varieties of cloth) Rules, 1975.
- कां०प्रा० 95 (प्र) दिनांक 14 फरवरी, 1975। तदेव। खादी तथा अन्य हथकरघा उद्योग विकास (रेयन तथा कृत्रिम रेशम के कपड़ों की कतिपय किस्मों पर प्रतिरिक्त उत्पाद शुल्क के संवाय से छूट) संशोधन नियम, 1975।
- S.O. 95 (E), dated the 14th February 1975. Do. Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development (Exemption from payment of Additional Excise Duty on certain varieties of rayon and artificial silk (fabrics) Amendment Rules, 1975.

67.	का०प्रा० 96 (घ) दिनांक 15 भारत परिसीमन आयोग फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 96 (E), dated the 15th February, 1975.	Delimitation Commission, India	Delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly constituencies in the State of Tripura.
68.	का०प्रा० 97 (घ) दिनांक 15 त्रिपुरा फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 97 (E), dated the 15th February 1975.	Do.	Delimitation of Assembly constituencies in the Union Territory of Mizoram.
69.	का०प्रा० 98 (घ) दिनांक 15 तदैय फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 98 (E), dated the 15th February, 1975.	Do.	Delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly constituencies in the State of Meghalaya.
70.	का०प्रा० 99 (घ), दिनांक 15, भारत निर्वाचन आयोग फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 99 (E), dated the 15th February, 1975.	Do.	Delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly constituencies in the State of Assam.
71.	का०प्रा० 100 (घ) दिनांक 15 गृह मंत्रालय फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 100 (E), dated the 15th February, 1975.	Ministry of Home Affairs	The Administrator of the Union Territory of Delhi shall also exercise the powers of the Central Govt. under sub-sections (1) and (2) of section 31 of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957.
72.	का०प्रा० 101 (घ) दिनांक 17 उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 101 (E), dated the 17th February, 1975.	Ministry of Industry & Civil Supplies.	Amendment in the Notification of the Govt. of India in the late Ministry of Industrial Development, Internal Trade and Company Affairs (Deptt. of Industrial Development) S.O. 711, dated the 18th February, 1970.
73.	का०प्रा० 102 (घ) दिनांक 17 मंत्रिमण्डल सचिवालय फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 102 (E), dated the 17th February, 1975.	Cabinet Secretariat	Govt. of India (Allocation of Business) (one hundred and seventh Amendment) Rules, 1975.
74.	का०प्रा० 103 (घ) दिनांक 17 उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 103 (E)/18E/IDRA/75, dated the 17th February, 1975.	Ministry of Industry & Civil Supplies.	Exemptions, restrictions and limitations subject to which provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 mentioned in col. (1) of the schedule shall continue to apply to the industrial undertaking.
75.	का०प्रा० 104 (घ)/18E/आई०डी० आर०ए०/75, दिनांक 17, फरवरी 1975। S.O. 104 (E)/18E/IDRA/75, dated the 17th February, 1975.	Do.	Exemptions, restrictions and limitations subject to which the provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 mentioned in col. (1) of the Schedule shall continue to apply to the industrial undertaking.
76.	का०प्रा० 105 (घ) दिनांक 19 भारत निर्वाचन आयोग फरवरी, 1975। S.O. 105 (E), dated the 19th February, 1975.	Election Commission of India	22nd February 1975 is the period within which a claim for the inclusion of a name or an objection to any entry in the electoral rolls for the Delhi Sadar and Chandni Chowk Parliamentary constituencies in the Union Territory of Delhi shall be lodged.

77. कां० 106 (घ) दिनांक, 19 कार्यालय जांच आयोग
फरवरी, 1975।
S.O. 106 (E), dated the 19th February, 1975. Office of the Commission of Inquiry.
पंजाब राज्य के कुछ भूतपूर्व मंत्रियों के विरुद्ध लगाये गये आरोपों की जांच करने के लिए जांच आयोग की नियुक्ति।
Appointing Commission of Inquiry to inquire into certain allegations made against certain former Ministers of the State of Punjab.
78. कां० 107 (घ) दिनांक उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय।
21 फरवरी, 1975।
S.O. 107 (E), dated the 21st February 1975. Ministry of Industry and Civil Supplies.
वाणिज्यिक यान (पुनः विक्रय पर निर्बंधन) आदेश, 1974 को उन बातों की बाबत के सिवाय, तुरन्त प्रभावी रूप से विरुद्धित करती है जो ऐसे विरुद्धन से पूर्व की गई हो या करने से रह गई हों।
Rescission of the commercial vehicles (Restrictions on Resale) Order, 1974 except as respects things done or omitted to be done before such rescission.
79. कां० 108 (घ) दिनांक 22 भ्रम मंत्रालय
फरवरी, 1975।
S.O. 108 (E), dated the 22nd February, 1975. Ministry of Labour
मैसर्स डेहरी रोहतास लाइट रेलवे कम्पनी लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बन्धित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद।
Adjudication of an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Messrs. Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Company Limited and their workmen.
- कां० 109 (घ) दिनांक, 22 तदैव
फरवरी, 1975।
S.O. 109 (E), dated the 22nd February 1975. Do.
मैसर्स डेहरी रोहतास लाइट रेलवे कम्पनी लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बन्धित विवाद को विद्यमान हड़ताल जारी रखना प्रतिबिद्ध करती है।
Prohibition in the continuance of strike in the management of M/s. Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Co. Ltd., with their workmen.
80. कां० 110 (घ) दिनांक, 24 ऊर्जा मंत्रालय
फरवरी, 1975।
S.O. 110 (E), dated the 24th February, 1975. Ministry of Energy
अनुसूची 'क' और 'ख' में विनिर्दिष्ट प्लॉट और खनन अधिकार अर्जित करने की सूचना।
Notice to acquire plots and mining rights described in Schedules A. and B.
81. कां० 111 (घ) दिनांक 25 वाणिज्य मंत्रालय
फरवरी, 1975।
S.O. 111 (E), dated the 25th February, 1975. Ministry of Commerce
हथकरघा अथवा शक्तिशालित करघा उद्योग में विनिर्मित वस्त्रों को छोड़ कर सभी वस्त्रों तथा भारत में निर्मित सभी वस्त्र मशीनों पर 0.025 प्रतिशत यथामूल्य उत्पादन शुल्क निर्धारित।
Levy of 0.025 per cent ad-valorem cess on all textiles and on all textile machinery manufactured in India except the textiles manufactured from out of handloom or powerloom industry.
82. कां० 112 (घ)/18 एए/आई० उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय
डी० आर० ए०/75, दिनांक 25 फरवरी, 1975।
S.O. 112 (E)/18AA/IDRA/75, Ministry of Industry & Civil dated the 25th February 1975. Supplies.
भारत के औद्योगिक विकास मंत्रालय के आदेश सं० कां० 529 (ई)/18एए/आई० डी० आर० ए०/74, तारीख 6 सितम्बर, 1974 में संशोधन।
Amendment in the order of the Govt. of India in the Ministry of Industrial Development No. S.O. 529 (E)/18 AA/IDRA/74, dated the 6th Sept. 1974.
83. कां० 113 (घ) दिनांक, 26 भारत परिसीमन आयोग
फरवरी, 1975।
S.O. 113 (E), dated the 26th February, 1975. Delimitation Commission.
पंजाब राज्य के बारे में अनुसूचित जातियों के लिए स्थानों का आरक्षण।
Reservation of S.C. seats in respect of the State of Punjab.
84. S.O. 114 (E), dated the 28th February, 1975. Ministry of Steel & Mines
श्री M.S. Bhatnagar, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Steel and Mines (Department of Mines) appointed as controller of Aluminium.

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 18 जून, 1975

का० प्रा० 2721.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के निर्वाचन के लिए 184-मेड़ता निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री दरियाव सिंह, ग्राम तथा पट्टालय बढायली तहसील मेड़ता, जिला नागौर, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रस्तावित नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री दरियाव सिंह को संसद् के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० राज०-वि० सं० 184/72(60)]

बी० नागसुब्रमण्यन, सचिव

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

ORDER

New Delhi, the 18th June, 1975

S.O. 2721.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Dariyao Singh, Village and Post Office Badayali, Tehsil Merta, District Nagur, Rajasthan, a contesting candidate for General Elections to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in March, 1972, from 184-Merta constituency has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

And, whereas, the said candidate even after the due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Dariyao Singh to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/184/72(60)]

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 1975

का० प्रा० 2722.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 22-करेरा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री लक्ष्मी, ग्राम तोरमोडी, पो० विनारा, परगना करेरा, जिला शिवपुरी लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रस्तावित नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री लक्ष्मी को संसद् के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० म० प्र०-वि० सं०/22/72(87)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th July, 1975

S.O. 2722.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ladu, Village Tormodi, Post Office Dinara, Pargana Karera District Shivpuri who was a contesting candidate for election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 22-Karera constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ladu to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly of Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP-LA/22/72(87)]

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 28, जुलाई, 1975

का० प्रा० 2723.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 196 छमरा (म० ज० जा०) निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मूलचन्द, ग्राम, पो० केदारपुर, तहसील लखनादन, जिला सिन्धी लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण प्रस्तावित नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मूलचन्द को संसद् के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधानसभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० म० प्र०-वि० सं०/196/72(88)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 28th July, 1975

S.O. 2723.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mulchand, Andlo, Post Kedarpur, Tahsil Lakhnadon, District Seoni who was a contesting candidate for election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 196-Chhapara constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And, whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10 A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mulchand to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP-LA/196/72(88)]

आदेश

क्र० प्र० 2724.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 133 कटिहार निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री रामकुमार डालमिया, मिरचाबारी ब्लोक, कटिहार, जिला पूर्णिया राज्य लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री रामकुमार डालमिया को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि०सं०/133/72 (208)]

ORDER

S.O. 2724.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ram Kumar Dalmia, Mirchaibari Chowk, Katihar, District Purnea who was a contesting candidate for election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from 133-Katihar constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And, whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ram Kumar Dalmia to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/133/72(208)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 1975

क्र० प्र० 2725.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 226 काराकट निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री चन्डी प्रसाद सिंह, ग्राम घनगढ़, विक्रम गंज, शाहाबाद लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित समय के अन्दर तथा रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी असफलता के लिये कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है। और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री चन्डी प्रसाद सिंह को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि०सं०/226/72(209)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 29th July, 1975

S.O. 2725.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Chandi Prasad Singh, Village Dhangain, Bikramganj, Shahabad who was a contesting candidate for election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from 226-Karakat constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses within the time and in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And, whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Chandi Prasad Singh to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/226/72(209)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 1975

क्र० प्र० 2726.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 236 राजगढ़ निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री राम सिंह सांकला, ग्राम ब डाकघर संडावला, परगना सारंगपुर, जिला राजगढ़ लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गये नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है,

और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री रामसिंह सांकला को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० म०प्र०-वि० सं० 236/72(89)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 30th July, 1975

S.O. 2726.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ram Singh Sankla, Village Sandawta P.O. Sandawta, Pargana Sarangpur District Rajgarh, who was a contesting candidate for election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 236-Rajgarh constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ram Singh Sankla to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP-LA/236/72(89)]

आदेश

क्र० भा० 2727—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 352-बाह निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री अश्वलु अजीज नि० ग्राम जैतपुर तहसील बाह, जिला अग्रा, उत्तर प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री अश्वलु अजीज को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० उ० प्र०-वि० सं०/352/74(23)]

ORDER

S.O. 2727.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Abdul Aziz, Village Jaitpur, Tahsil Bah, District Agra, U.P. a contesting candidate for election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 352. Bah assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

63 G I/75-2

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Abdul Aziz to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/352/74(23)]

आदेश

क्र० भा० 2728—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 352-बाह निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री राम चरण, ग्राम उदैपुर, पोस्ट रीछपुरा, जिला अग्रा, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गये नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री राम चरण को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० उ० प्र०-वि० सं०/352/74(24)]

ORDER

S.O. 2728.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ram Charan, Village Udaipur Kalan, Post Richhpura, District Agra, Uttar Pradesh a contesting candidate for election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 352. Bah assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ram Charan to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/352/74(24)]

आदेश

मई दिल्ली, 1 अगस्त 1975

क्र० भा० 2729—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 24 कांठ निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मनबाबल हक, ग्राम सराय खजूर, बाकखामा कांठ, जिला मुरादाबाद, (उत्तर प्रदेश), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 के अनुसूचन में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री अनवारुल हुक को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ० प्र०-वि० सं०/24/74(31)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 1st August, 1975

S.O. 2729.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Anwarul Huq, Village Sarai Khajoor, P. O. Kanth, District Moradabad, U.P., a contesting candidate or election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 24-Kanth assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Anwarul Huq to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/24/74(31)]

प्रादेश

का० प्रा० 2730.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि 1974 में हुए उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 24 कांठ निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सोहन, मुहल्ला बटवाल, डाकखाना भमरीहा, जिला मुराबाबाद, उत्तर प्रदेश,

लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्घीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों को कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसूचन में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री सोहन को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ० प्र०-वि० सं०/24/74(32)]

ORDER

S.O. 2730.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sohan, Mohalla Batwal, P.O. Amroha, District Moradabad, U.P. a contesting candidate for election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from 24-Kanth assembly constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sohan to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/24/74(32)]

प्रादेश

का० प्रा० 2731.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 205 पटना पूर्व निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बृजेन्द्र, हाजीपुर, डाकखाने के निकट, जिला मुजफ्फरपुर (बिहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्घीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसूचन में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री बृजेन्द्र को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं०/205/72(210)]

ORDER

S.O. 2731.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Brijendra, Hazipur, Near Post Office, District Muzaffarpur who was a contesting candidate for election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from 205-Patna East constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Brijendra to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/205/72(210)]

भारत

का० प्रा० 2732 :—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972, में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 208 मंथर निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री उपेन्द्र कुमार सिन्हा, ग्राम सत्तर, पो० सराय बाया खगोल, जिला पटना लोक, प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पन्न सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण प्रस्तुत नहीं किया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री उपेन्द्र कुमार सिन्हा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस प्रदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं०/208/72(218)]

ORDER

S.O. 2732.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Upendra Kumar Sinha, Village Sattar, P.O. Sarai via Khagaul, District Patna who was a contesting candidate for election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from 208-Manner constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Upendra Kumar Sinha to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/208/72(211)]

भारत

का० प्रा० 2733 :—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए बिहार, विधान सभा के लिये साधारण निर्वाचन के लिये 209 क्रम निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री शिवलाल राम, ग्राम तथा पो० तिसखौरा, जिला पटना लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गये नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित समय के अन्दर तथा रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये प्रत्यावेदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री शिवलाल राम को संसद के किसी भी सदन

के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस प्रदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं०/209/72(212)]

ए० एन० सेन, सचिव

ORDER

S.O. 2733.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Shiv Lal Ram, Village & P.O. Tiskhora, District Patna who was a contesting candidate for election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from 209-Bikram constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses within the time and in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Shiv Lal Ram to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/209/72(212)]

A. N. SEN, Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

पुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 5 अगस्त, 1975

का० प्रा० 2734 :—भारत के राजपत्र, प्रसाधारण, भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (II), तारीख 1 सितम्बर, 1968 के पृष्ठ 932-961 पर, भारत सरकार के वित्त मंत्रालय (राजस्व और बीमा विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० प्रा० 3117, तारीख 1 सितम्बर 1968 के साथ प्रकाशित स्वर्ण नियंत्रण (प्रसंग, फीस और प्रकीर्ण मामले) नियम, 1968 में,—पृष्ठ 947 पर, पंक्ति 17 में, “39 (4) (ख)” के स्थान पर “39 (4) (ग)” पढ़ें ।

[सं० फा० 131/16/74-जीसी० II]

एम० एम० भटनागर, उप-सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue & Insurance)

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 5th August, 1975

S.O. 2734.—In the Gold Control (Forms, Fees and Miscellaneous Matters) Rules, 1968, published with the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) No. S.O. 3117, dated the 1st September, 1968, at pages 932—961 of the Gazette

of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii), dated the 1st September, 1968,—

at page 947, in line 17, for "39(4)(b)" read "39(4)(c)".

[No. F. 131/16/74-GC. II]

M. M. BHATNAGAR, Dy. Secy.

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 अगस्त, 1975

स्टाम्प

का० प्रा० 2735.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उस शुल्क से, जो गुजरात राज्य विस्त निगम द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले एक सौ लाख रुपये मूल्य के डिबेंचरों के रूप में बन्धपत्रों पर उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन प्रभाव है, छूट देती है।

[सं० 34/75-स्टाम्प/का० सं० 471/60/75-सीमाशुल्क VII]

डी० के० आचार्य, अवर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 13th August, 1975

STAMPS

S.O. 2735.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899) the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the bonds in the form of debentures to the value of one hundred lakhs of rupees, issued by the Gujarat State Financial Corporation, are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 34/75-Stamp/F. No. 471/60/75-Cus. VII]

D. K. ACHARYA, Under Secy.

बैंकिंग विभाग

नयी दिल्ली 4 जुलाई, 1975

का० प्रा० 2736.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 तथा बैंककारी विनियमन (कम्पनी) नियमावली, 1949 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर यह घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 31 तथा उक्त नियमावली, के नियम 15 के उपबन्ध निम्नलिखित बैंकिंग कम्पनी पर वहाँ तक लागू नहीं होंगे, जहाँ तक उनका सम्बन्ध उस कम्पनी के 31 दिसम्बर, 1974 को समाप्त वर्ष के तुलन-पत्र तथा लाभ और हानि विवरण को लेखा परीक्षक की रिपोर्ट के साथ समाचार पत्र में प्रकाशित करने से है :

हरिया इण्डस्ट्रियल बैंक प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, हरिया

[सं० 15(28) बी० प्रो० 3/75]

मे० प्रा० उस्तावकर, अवर सचिव

(Department of Banking)

New Delhi, the 4th July, 1975

S.O. 2736.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949)

and Rule 16 of the Banking Regulation (Companies) Rules, 1949, the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 31 of the said Act and Rule 15 of the said Rules shall not apply to the undernoted banking company in so far as they relate to the publication of its balance-sheet and profit and loss account for the year ended 31st December 1974, together with the auditor's report in a newspaper.

Jharia Industrial Bank Private Ltd., Jharia.

[No. 15(28)-B.O. III/75]

M. B. USGAONKAR, Under Secy.

बम्बई केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समाहृतलय

बम्बई, 27 जून, 1975

का० प्रा० 2737.—केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियमावली 1944 के नियम 55 के अन्तर्गत मुझे प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं एतद्वारा यह निर्धारित करता हूँ कि इस अधिसूचना के साथ नयी सारणी के कालम 3 में विनिर्दिष्ट शुल्केय वस्तु के सम्बन्ध में सारणी के कालम 4 में दर्शाए गए मुख्य कच्चे मालों के लिए कच्चा माल खाता रखना होगा। उन सभी निर्धारितियों को जो ओ टैरिफ मद संख्या 14 एफ एफ के अधीन आने वाले उत्पादों का विनिर्माण करते हैं, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियमावली 1944 के नियम 55 के अधीन निर्धारित प्रपत्र प्रार० टी० -5 में त्रैमासिक विवरणिका देनी होगी और नियम 55 के अन्तर्गत अपेक्षित इस विवरणिका में उत्पादित प्रसंस्कृत माल (दूध पेस्ट) का परिमाण भी दर्शाना होगा :-

क्रम संख्या	टैरिफ मद संख्या	विवरण	महत्वपूर्ण कच्चे मालों का नाम
1	2	3	4
1.	14 एफ एफ	दूध पेस्ट	डाई-कैल्शियम फास्फेट तथा बबने वाली नली (आधानों के रूप में प्रयुक्त)

अधि० सं० के० उ० शु०/सी० ई० प्रार०/55/(1) 1975-का० सं० V (30)-73/मिस्ले/75]

BOMBAY CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE

Bombay, the 27th June, 1975

S.O. 2737.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Rule 55 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I hereby prescribe that in respect of the excisable commodity mentioned in column 3 of the table appended to this notification the raw material account should be maintained in respect of the principal raw materials shown in column 4 of the table. All the assesses manufacturing products falling under Tariff item No. 14FF should furnish the quarterly return in Form R.T. 5 prescribed under Rule 55 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, showing

also the quantity of the finished goods (toothpaste) produced, as required under Rule 55.

S.No.	Tariff Item No.	Description	Name of important raw materials
1	2	3	4
1.	14-FF	Tooth paste	Di-calcium phosphate and Collapsible Tubes (Used as containers).

[Notification No.CE/CER/55/(1)/1975-F. No. V(30)-73/Misc/75]
J. DUTTA, Collector

वाणिज्य मन्त्रालय

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 अगस्त, 1975

का० आ० 2738.—यतः कि भारत के निर्यात व्यापार के विकास के लिए कतिपय प्रस्ताव उच्च तापसह ईंटों से सम्बन्धित भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मन्त्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 2516, ता० 22 अगस्त, 1966 में संशोधन करने के लिए, निर्यात (कवालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 के उपनियम (2) की अपेक्षानुसार, भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मन्त्रालय के आदेश सं० का० आ० 782, ता० 23 मार्च, 1974 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड-3, उपखंड (ii) में, उनके द्वारा संभावितः प्रभावित होने वाले सभी लोगों से आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिन के भीतर आक्षेप तथा सुझाव मांगते हुए प्रकाशित किए गए थे :

और यतः उक्त राजपत्र की प्रतियां जनता को 19 अप्रैल, 1974 को उपलब्ध कराई गई थी ।

और यतः उक्त प्रारूप पर जनता से कोई भी आक्षेप या सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए थे;

अतः, अब, निर्यात (कवालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात, निरीक्षण परिषद् से परामर्श के पश्चात् भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मन्त्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 2516, ता० 22 अगस्त, 1966 में एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

(i) पैरा 2 के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित पैरा रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“2. इस अधिसूचना के उच्च ताप-सह ईंटों से इस अधिसूचना के उपाबंध 1 में वर्णित किसी भी प्रकार की उच्च तापसह ईंट अभिप्रेत है।”

(ii) उपाबंध 1 में, क्रम संख्या 6 और उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टि के पश्चात्, निम्नलिखित क्रम संख्या और प्रविष्टि अन्तः स्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“7. उष्मारोधी ईंटें।”

(iii) उपाबंध 2 के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित उपाबंध रखा जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“उपाबंध 2”

1. अग्नि-सह-मिट्टी की उच्च तापसह ईंटें

(i) मध्यम ताप कार्य के लिए अग्नि-सह मिट्टी का० सा०
की उच्चतापसह ईंटें ग्रुप “ए” 6—1967

(ii) मध्यम ताप कार्य के लिए अग्नि-सह मिट्टी की उच्चतापसह ईंटें ग्रुप “बी” 7—1967

(iii) उच्च ताप कार्य के लिए अग्नि-सह मिट्टी की उच्चतापसह ईंटें 6—1967

(iv) नौसैनिक पोतों के तेल प्रक्षालित वायुलेर भट्टियों के लिए अग्नि-सह मिट्टी की उच्च तापसह ईंटें 483—1953

(v) अग्नि-सह मिट्टी के कांच टैंक खंड (ब्लाक) 1522—1967

(vi) गुम्बदी मिट्टी के लिए अग्नि-सह मिट्टी की उच्चतापसह ईंटें 1751—1968

(vii) अग्नि-सह मिट्टी के रोधक 4565—1968

(viii) अग्नि-सह मिट्टी के चूचु (नोज़िफस) 4564—1968

(ix) इस्पात संयंत्र के लिए तली में डालने वाली उच्च-ताप सह ईंटें 1523—1960

(x) उच्च ताप सह नली (स्लीव्स) 1524—1968

2. बैसिक उच्च तापसह ईंटें

(i) इस्पात संयंत्र के लिए मैग्नेसाइट उच्च तापसह ईंटें 1749—1961

(ii) छत के अस्तरण के लिए रासायनिक प्रक्रिया से बनी मैग्नेसाइट क्रोम उच्च तापसह ईंटें 4801—1968

(iii) साधारण प्रयोजनों के लिए रासायनिक प्रक्रिया से बनी क्रोम-मैग्नेसाइट उच्च तापसह ईंटें 4813—1968

(iv) साधारण प्रयोजनों के लिए दग्ध मैग्नेसाइट क्रोम उच्च तापसह ईंटें 3304—1965

(v) साधारण प्रयोजनों के लिए रासायनिक प्रक्रिया से बनी मैग्नेसाइट क्रोम उच्च तापसह ईंटें 4814—1965

(vi) साधारण प्रयोजनों के लिए दग्ध क्रोम मैग्नेसाइट उच्च तापसह ईंटें 3805—1965

3. सेलखड़ी का उच्च तापसह ईंटें

(i) साधारण प्रयोजनों के लिए सेलखड़ी की उच्चतापसह ईंटें 484—1958

(ii) सेलखड़ी युक्त अग्नि-सह मिट्टी की उच्च तापसह ईंटें 2043—1968

(iii) कोयले की भट्टियों के लिए सेलखड़ी की उच्चतापसह ईंटें 4812—1968

4. सिलिमेनाइट

(i) कांच पिघलाने के टैंक वाली भट्टियों के लिए सिलिमेनाइट उच्च तापसह ईंटें 2044—1962

(ii) कांच पिघलाने की भट्टियों के लिए प्राकृतिक सिलिमेनाइट उच्च तापसह ईंटें 2045—1962

5. उष्मारोधी ईंटें

उष्मारोधी उच्च तापसह 2043—1962

[सं० 6(21)/73-नि० नि० तथा नि० सं०]

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd August, 1975

S.O. 2738.—Whereas for the development of export trade of India certain proposals for amending the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 2516, dated the 22nd August, 1966, regarding Refractory Bricks were published as required by sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964, in the Gazette of India, Part II Section 3—Sub-section (ii), dated the 23rd March, 1974 under the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 782 dated the 23rd March 1974, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby within thirty days from the date of publication of the order in the official Gazette:

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette were made available to the public on 19th April, 1974.

And whereas no objections and suggestions were received from the public on the said draft;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government, after consulting the Export Inspection Council, hereby makes the following further amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 2516, dated the 22nd August, 1966, namely:—

(i) for paragraph 2, the following paragraph shall be substituted, namely:—

“2. In this notification “refractory bricks” shall mean any of the refractory bricks of any shape mentioned in Annexure I to this notification.”

(ii) In Annexure I, after serial number 6 and the entry relating thereto, the following serial number and entry shall be inserted, namely:—

“7. Insulating Bricks”.

(iii) for Annexure II, the following Annexure shall be substituted, namely :—

“ANNEXURE II”

1. Fireclay Refractory Bricks.

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| (i) Moderate heat duty fireclay refractories, Group 'A' | IS : 6--1967 |
| (ii) Moderate heat duty fireclay refractories, Group 'B' | IS : 7-1967 |
| (iii) Fireclay refractories high heat duty | IS : 8--1967 |
| (iv) Fireclay refractories for oil fired boiler furnace of naval ships | IS : 483—1953 |
| (v) Fireclay glass tank blocks | IS : 1522—1967 |
| (vi) Fireclay coupola refractories | IS : 1751—1968 |
| (vii) Fireclay stoppers | IS : 4565—1968 |
| (viii) Fireclay nozzles | IS : 4564—1968 |
| (ix) Bottom purging refractories for steel plants | IS : 1523—1960 |
| (x) Refractory sleeves | IS : 1524—1968 |

2. Basic Refractory Bricks

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| (i) Magnesite refractories for steel plant | IS : 1749—1961 |
| (ii) Chemically-bonded magnesite-chrome-refractories for roof lining | IS : 4801—1968 |
| (iii) Chemically-bonded chrome-magnesite refractories for general purposes | IS : 4813—1968 |
| (iv) Burnt magnesite-chrome refractories for general purposes | IS : 3304—1965 |
| (v) Chemically bonded magnesite chrome refractories for general purposes | IS : 4814—1965 |
| (vi) Burnt chrome-magnesite refractories for general purposes | IS : 3305—1965 |

3. Silica Refractory Bricks.

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| (i) Silica refractories for general purposes | IS : 484—1958 |
| (ii) Siliceous fireclay refractories | IS : 2043—1963 |
| (iii) Silica refractories for coke ovens | IS : 4812—1968 |

4. Sillimanite Bricks

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| (i) Sillimanite refractories for glass melting tank furnaces | IS : 2044—1962 |
| (ii) Natural sillimanite refractories for glass melting furnaces | IS : 2045—1962 |

5. Insulating Bricks

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| Insulating refractories | IS : 2043—1962 |
|-------------------------|----------------|

[No. 6(21)/73-EI & EP]

का० आ० 2738.—निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उच्च तापसह ईंटें निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 में और आगे संशोधन के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम उच्चतापसह ईंटें निर्यात (निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1975 है।

(2) ये को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. उच्च तापसह ईंटें निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 में :

(2) नियम 2, के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“2. परिभाषा :—इन नियमों में, उच्चतापसह ईंटों से इन नियमों की प्रसूची में वर्णित किसी भी आकार का उच्चतापसह ईंटें अभिप्रेत है।”

(1) नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“7. अपील :—(1) नियम 4 के उप नियम (4) के अधीन अधिकरण द्वारा प्रमाण-पत्र देने से इनकार करने से व्यक्ति कोई व्यक्ति, उसे ऐसे इनकार की सूचना प्राप्त होने से दस दिनों के भीतर, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा इस प्रयोजनार्थ गठित तीन व्यक्तियों से भ्रूत विशेषज्ञों के पैनल को, जिसमें कम से कम दो व्यक्ति गैर सरकारी होंगे, अपील कर सकेगा।

(2) पैनल में विशेषज्ञों के पैनल की कुल सदस्यता के कम से कम दो-तिहाई गैर सरकारी सदस्य होंगे।

(3) ऐसी अपील पर इसके सभी सदस्यों द्वारा विनिश्चय किया जाएगा तथा वही अन्तम होगा।

(4) प्रत्येक अपील साधारणतया उसकी प्राप्ति के पन्द्रह दिन के भीतर निपटा दी जाएगी।

(iii) उक्त नियमों की प्रसूची में, कम संख्या 6 तथा उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टि के पश्चात्, निम्नलिखित अन्तः स्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“7. उच्चारोपी ईंटें।”

[सं. 6(21)/73-नि० वि० तथा नि० सं०]

S.O. 2739.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Export of Refractory Bricks (Inspection) Rules, 1966, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Refractory Bricks (Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1975;

(2) They shall come into force on the.....

2. In the Export of Refractory Bricks (Inspection) Rules, 1966.

(i) for rule 2, the following rule shall be substituted, namely :—

"2. Definition—In these rules 'refractory bricks' mean any of refractory bricks of any shape mentioned in the Schedule to these rules."

(ii) for rule 7, the following rule shall be substituted, namely :—

"7. Appeal—(i) Any person aggrieved by the refusal of the agency to issue a certificate under sub-rule (4) of rule 4, may, within ten days of the receipt of the communication of such refusal by him, prefer an appeal to a panel of experts consisting of not less than three but not more than seven persons of whom at least two persons shall be non-officials, appointed for the purpose by the Central Government.

(2) The panel will consist of at least two-third of non-officials of the total membership of the panel of experts.

(3) The decision of the panel on such appeal shall be taken by all its members and the same shall be final.

(4) Every appeal shall ordinarily be disposed of within fifteen days of its receipt."

(iii) In the schedule to the said rules, after serial number 6 and the entry relating thereto, the following shall be inserted, namely :—

"7. Insulating Bricks."

[No. 6 (21)/73-EI & EP]

का० प्रा० 2740.—निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरोक्षण अधिनियम 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 2518, ता० 22 अगस्त 1966 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, अनुसूची ii में क्रम संख्या 6 तथा उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टि के पश्चात्, निम्नलिखित जोड़ा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"7. उष्मारोधी ईंट"

2. यह अधिसूचना को प्रवृत्त होगी ।

[सं० 6(21)/73-नि० नि० तथा नि० सं०]

के० वी बालसुब्रह्मण्यम, उप-निदेशक

S.O. 2740.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce, No. S.O. 2518 dated the 22nd August, 1966, namely :—

In the said notification, in Schedule II, after serial No. 6 and the entry relating thereto, following shall be added, namely :—

"7". Insulating Bricks".

2. This notification shall come into force on the

[No. 6 (21)/73-EI&EP]

K. V. BALASUBRAMANIAM, Dy. Director

मुख्य निर्यातक, आयात निर्यात का कार्यालय,

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 1 अगस्त, 1975

का० प्रा० 2741.—सर्वश्री दि महाराष्ट्र शुगर मिल्स लि०, बम्बई को शीशे की बोतलों के विनिर्माण के लिए सामान्य मुद्रा क्षेत्र से आरक्षितक द्राइआक्साइड के आयात के लिए 14,000 रुपये मूल्य का एक लाइसेंस संख्या: पी/डी/2198893, दिनांक 24-6-74 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है। यह भी उल्लेख किया गया है कि विषयाधीन मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति पर किसी भी धनराशि का उपयोग नहीं किया गया था और यह कि वह किसी भी सीमा शुल्क समारहता के कार्यालय में पंजीकृत नहीं की गई थी।

2. अपने तर्कों के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथपत्र दाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट हैं कि लाइसेंस संख्या: पी/डी/2198893, दिनांक 24-6-74 की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है और निर्देश देता है कि इसकी अनुलिपि प्रति आवेदक को जारी की जानी चाहिए। लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति रद्द की जाती है।

[संख्या: लास-24(1)/ए एम-74/भार एम-3/1116]

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 1st August, 1975

S.O. 2741.—M/s. The Maharashtra Sugar Mills Limited, Bombay were granted licence No. P/D/2198893 dated 24-6-74 for import of Arsenic Trioxide for the manufacture of glass bottles for Rs. 14,000/- from the General Currency Area. They have requested for issue of the duplicate Exchange Control copy of the licence on the ground that the Original Exchange Control Copy has been lost. It has further been stated that the Exchange Control Copy of in question was lost after utilising rupees nil and that the same had not been registered with any of the Collectors of Customs.

2. In support of their contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Exchange Control Copy of Licence No. P/D/2198893 dated 24-6-74 has been lost and directs that duplicate Exchange Control Copy of the said licence should be issued to them. The Original Exchange Control Copy of the licence is cancelled.

[Ref. No. Glass-24(1)/A.M. 74/R.M. 3/1116]

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 अगस्त, 1975

का० प्रा० 2742.—सर्वश्री स्मिथ एंड नेप्पू (इन्डिया) लि०, बम्बई को सेवज एवं फर्मास्यूटिकल के विनिर्माण के लिए कच्चे माल के आयात के लिये 37,100 रुपये का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/डी/2198233 दिनांक 21-5-74 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई है। प्रागे यह बताया गया है कि विषयाधीन मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति 19,474 रुपये के लिये उपयोग करने के बाद खो गई थी। अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति की आवश्यकता शेष मूल्य अर्थात् 17,626 रुपये को पूरा करने के लिये है। और यह सीमा शुल्क समारहता बम्बई, के पास पंजीकृत कराने के बाद खो गई है।

अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि लाइसेंस सं० पी/सी/2198233 दिनांक 21-5-74 की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और निवेश देता है कि उन्हें उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए। लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति रद्द की जाती है।

[संख्या: सी एच/एस. 70(1)/ए० एम०-74/आरएम 3/884]

ए० एन० चटर्जी, उप-मुख्य, नियंत्रक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th August, 1975

S.O. 2742.—M/s. Smith and Nephew (India) Limited Bombay were granted Licence No. P/D/2198233 dated 21-5-74 for Import of Raw Materials for the manufacture of Drugs and Pharmaceuticals for Rs. 37,100 from General Crenency Area. They have requested for the issue of the duplicate Exchange Control Purposes Copy of the licence on the grounds that the original Exchange Control Purposes Copy has been lost. It has further been stated that the Exchange Control Purposes Copy in question was lost after utilising an amount of Rs. 19,474. The Duplicate Exchange Control Purposes Copy is required to cover the balance amount of Rs. 17,626. The same has been lost after having been registered with the Collector of Customs, Bombay.

2. In support of their contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the Original Exchange Control Purposes Copy of Licence No. P/D/2198233 dated 21-5-74 has been lost/misplaced and directs that duplicate Exchange Control Purposes Copy of the said licence should be issued to them. The Original Exchange Control Purposes Copy of the licence is cancelled.

[No. CH/S-70(1)/A.M. 74/R.M. 3/884]

A. N. CHATTERJI, Dy. Chief Controller,
for Chief Controller

आदेश

क्रा० आ० 2743.—यथा संशोधित आयात नियंत्रण आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर अधोहस्ताक्षरी इसके द्वारा सर्वश्री हिन्दुस्तान मशीन टूल्स लि०, हैदराबाद को यू० के०/भारत पूंजीनिवेश ऋण 1972 (सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र सेगमेंट) के अन्तर्गत 1,50,000.00 रुपये (एक लाख पचास हजार रुपये मात्र) के लिए जारी किए गए आयात लाइसेंस सं० (आई/सी/2064043/आर/के/44/एच/35, सी० जी० 2 दिनांक 13-7-72 को रद्द करता है।

रद्द करने का कारण यह है कि लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और उन्होंने उसी के बदले में अनुलिपि लाइसेंस जारी करने का अनुरोध किया है। लाइसेंस का पूरी तरह उपयोग कर लिया गया है और अब उसकी आवश्यकता पिछले संभरण की मुक्त बदलाई/कमी के पोतलवान को पूरा करने के लिये है।

[संख्या: सीजी. 2/आईसी(19)/72-73/639]

ORDER

S.O. 2743.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import Control Order, 1955, dated 7-12-1955 as amended, the undersigned hereby cancels the Customs Purposes Copy of Import Licence No. I/C/2064043/R/K/K/44/H/35/CG. dated 13-7-72 for Rs. 1,50,000.00 (Rs. One lakh fifty thousand only) issued under UK/India Capital Investment Loan 1972: (Public Sector Segment) to M/s. Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd., Hyderabad.

2. The reason for the cancellation is that the Customs Purposes copy of the licence has been lost/misplaced by the licensee who had requested for the issue of a duplicate licence in lieu thereof. The licence has been fully utilised and is required to cover shipments of free replacements/shortages of the previous supply only.

[No. CG. II/ID(19)/72-73/639]

आदेश

क्रा० आ० 2744.—यथा संशोधित आयात नियंत्रण आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर अधोहस्ताक्षरी इसके द्वारा सर्वश्री हिन्दुस्तान मशीन टूल्स लि०, हैदराबाद आन्ध्र प्रदेश को हंगरी क्रेडिट व्यवस्थाओं के अन्तर्गत संयंत्र एवं मशीनरी के आयात के लिये 4,42,50,000 रुपये (चार सौ ब्यासिस लाख पचास हजार रुपये मात्र) के लिए जारी किए गए आयात लाइसेंस सं० जी/सी/2067900/एच/आर/52/एच/39-40/सी जी-2 दिनांक 19-10-74 को रद्द करता है।

लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा रद्द करने का कारण यह बताया गया है कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई और उन्होंने उसी के बदले में अनुलिपि लाइसेंस जारी करने के लिए अनुरोध किया था।

[संख्या: सीजी. 2/एच आई-44/74-75/640]

एम० बी० तवाड़े, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक,

हुते मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

S.O. 2744.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import Control Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended, the undersigned hereby cancels the Exchange Control Copy of Import Licence No. G/C/2067900/HR/52/H/39/40/CG. II dated 19-10-74 for Rs. 4,42,50,000 (Rupees Four hundred and forty-two lakhs, fifty thousand only) issued to M/s. Hindustan Machine Tools Limited, Hyderabad Andhra Pradesh, for the import of Plant & Machine from Hungary under Hungarian Credit arrangements.

The reason for the cancellation is that the Exchange Control copy of the said licence has been lost/misplaced by the licensee who had requested for the issue of a duplicate licence in lieu thereof.

[No. CG. II/HI-44/74-75/640]

M. B. TAWADEY, Dy. Chief Controller
for Chief Controller

आदेश

बंगलूर, 19 अप्रैल, 1975

का० प्रा० 2745.—सर्वश्री भूर इण्डस्ट्रीज, 55, 18 वां वार्ड, मेन रोड, गान्धीनगर बेलारी-1 (अब सं० 29-सी 'ए' स्ट्रीट चौथी मेन रोड, अग्रहारा, डसराहल्ली, मगाडी रोड, बंगलूर-40) को अप्रैल-मार्च 1974 नीति के अनुसार कुछ सरणीबद्ध मर्चों अर्थात् पोलिथिलीन मोल्डिंग पाउडर (निम्न तथा उच्च घनत्व), नाइलन मोल्डिंग पाउडर (पोलिएमाइड) और पोलिप्रोपिलिन के आयात के लिए आयात लाइसेंस सं० जी/टी/1829083/आर एम एल/50/एक्स/37-38 दिनांक 25-3-74 मूल्य 9,750 रुपये (यू० के०) और सं० जी/टी/1829084/टी/ओ आर/50/एक्स/37-38 दिनांक 25-3-74 मूल्य 9,750 रुपये (रुपया भुगतान क्षेत्र) (लाइसेंस भारत के राज्य व्यापार निगम लि०, नई दिल्ली के नाम में और प्राधिकार पत्र आवेदक के नाम में) प्रदान किए गए थे। अब उक्त आवेदक ने यह घोषणा की है कि उक्त लाइसेंसें की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतियां बिल्कुल भी उपयोग किए बिना खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई हैं और निवेदन किया है कि जैसा कि उक्त लाइसेंस समर्पित कर दिए गए हैं उन्हें रद्द कर दिया जाए कि क्योंकि वे उनका उपयोग करने के लिए असमर्थ हैं।

2. उपर्युक्त तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंसें की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतियां खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई हैं और निवेश देता हूँ कि इन्हें रद्द किया जाए।

[सं० आई टी सी/एस एस आई/सी-362 से 364/ए एम, 74/एन पी]

ORDER

Bangalore, the 19th April, 1975

S.O. 2745.—M/s. Bhoor Industries, 55, 8th Ward, Main Road Gandhinagar, Bellary-1, (now at No. 29-C, 'A' Street, 4th Main Road, Agrahara, Dasarahalli, Magadi Road, Bangalore-40), were granted import licences No. G/T/1829083/R/ML/50/X/37-38 dt: 25-3-74 for Rs. 9,750 (UK) and No. G/T/1829084/T/OR/50/X/37238 dt. 25-3-74 for Rs. 9,750 (R.P.A.) (Licences in favour of S.T.C. of India Ltd. New Delhi with Letters of Authority in favour of the applicant) for import of certain canalised items viz., Polyethylene Moulding Powder (Low and High Density), Nylon Moulding Powder (Polyamide) and Polypropylene as per AM'74 policy. The said applicant has now declared the said licences (E.C. copies) have been lost/misplaced without having been utilised at all and have requested that the said licences be cancelled as surrendered, since they are unable to utilise the same.

2. In support of the above contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original E.C. Purpose copies of the above licences have been lost/misplaced and direct that the originally E.C. Purpose copies of the above licences be Cancelled.

[No. ITC/SSI/C.362 to 364/AM'74/NP]

आदेश

का० प्रा० 2746.—सर्वश्री भूर इण्डस्ट्रीज, 55, अठारहवां वार्ड, मेन रोड गान्धी नगर बेलारी-1 (अब सं० 29-सी, 'ए' स्ट्रीट चौथी मेन रोड, अग्रहारा, डसराहल्ली, मगाडी रोड, बंगलूर-40 पर स्थित) को अप्रैल-मार्च 74 नीति के अनुसार कुछ सरणीबद्ध मर्चों अर्थात् पोलिथिलीन मोल्डिंग पाउडर (निम्न घनत्व तथा उच्च घनत्व), नाइलन मोल्डिंग

63 GI/75 —3

पाउडर (पोलिएमाइड) और पोलिप्रोपिलिन के आयात के लिए 19,500 रुपये मूल्य का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० जी/टी 1829082/सी/एस/एक्स/50/एक्स/37-38 दिनांक 25-3-74 (लाइसेंस भारत के राज्य व्यापार निगम लि० नई दिल्ली के नाम में और प्राधिकार पत्र आवेदक के नाम में) प्रदान किया गया था। अब उक्त आवेदक ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति बिल्कुल भी उपयोग किए बिना खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और यह उल्लेख किया है कि अब उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि की लाइसेंस के पूर्ण मूल्य अर्थात् 19,500 रुपये के लिए आवश्यकता है।

2. उपर्युक्त तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और निवेश देता हूँ कि इसकी अनुलिपि प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए। उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए। उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति इसके द्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

[संख्या : आई टी सी/एस एस आई/सी-362 से 364/ए एम 74/एन पी]

आर० जयराम नायडू, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक,

ORDER

S.O. 2746.—M/s. Bhoor Industries, 55, 18th Ward, Main Road Gandhinagar, Bellary-1, (now at No. 29-C, 'A' Street, 4th Main Road, Agrahara, Dasarahalli, Magadi Road, Bangalore-40), were granted import licence No. G/T/1829082/C/XX/50/X/37-38 dated 25-3-1974 for Rs. 19,500/- (licence in favour of S.T.C. of India Ltd., New Delhi with Letter of Authority in favour of the applicant) for import of certain canalised items viz., Polyethylene Moulding Powder (Low Density and High Density), Nylon Moulding Powder (Polyamide) and Polypropylene as per AM'74 policy. The said applicant has now applied for duplicate copy of the E.C. Purposes copy of the above licence on the ground that the original of the said E.C. Purposes copy of the licence has been lost/misplaced without having been utilised at all and have stated that the duplicate copy of E.C. Purposes copy of the above licence now required is for the full value of the licence i.e. Rs. 19,500.

2. In support of the above contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original E.C. Purposes copy of the above licence has been lost/misplaced and direct that a duplicate copy of the E.C. Purpose copy of the above licence should be issued. The Original E.C. Purposes copy of the above licence is hereby cancelled.

[No. ITC/SSI/C-362-364/AM'74/NP]

R. JAYARAM NAIDU, Dy. Chief Controller

ऊर्जा मंत्रालय

कोयला विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 1975

का० प्रा० 2747.—कोयला वाले क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन, भारत सरकार के भूतत्त्व इस्पात और खान मंत्रालय (खान विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० 234, तारीख 9 जनवरी, 1974 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त अधिसूचना के उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट स्थल में 121.75 एकड़ (लगभग) या 49.75 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) भूमियों में कोयले का पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त भूमियों में कोयला अभिप्राप्य है;

प्रतः, ग्राम, कोयला वाले क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 7 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित 121.75 एकड़ (लगभग) या 49.75 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) भूमियों को अर्जित करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है।

2. इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखाओं का निरीक्षण उपायुक्त कार्यालय, रांची (बिहार) में या कोयला नियन्त्रक कार्यालय, 1-कौंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता में या राष्ट्रीय कोयला विकास निगम लिमिटेड कार्यालय (राजस्व अनुभाग), वरमंगा हाउस, रांची (बिहार) में किया जा सकता है।

3. कोयला नियन्त्रक, 1-कौंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता को केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा अधिनियम के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी नियुक्त किया गया है।

अनुसूची

खण्ड-1

(करकट्टा कोलियरी विस्तार)

उत्तर करन पुरा कोयला क्षेत्र

डा० सं० राजस्व

तारीख 25-3-75

(जिसमें अर्जित भूमियां वर्णित हैं)

सभी अधिकार

क्रम सं०	ग्राम	थाना	थाना सं०	जिला	क्षेत्र एकड़ों में	टिप्पणियां
1	नवाडीह	बर्मु	4	रांची	121.75 भाग	
					कुल क्षेत्र :—	121.75 एकड़ (लगभग) या 49.75 हेक्टेयर (लगभग)

नवाडीह ग्राम में अर्जित किए जाने वाले भू-खण्डों के संख्यांक 160 (पी), 161 (पी), 162 (पी), 206 (पी), और 207 (पी)

सीमा वर्णन :—

ए-बी लाइन नवाडीह ग्राम के भू-खण्ड सं० 162, 161 और 207 से होकर जाती है।

बी-सी लाइन नवाडीह ग्राम के भू-खण्ड सं० 207, 206 और पुनः 207 से होकर जाती है।

सी-डी लाइन ग्राम नवाडीह और तुमन्द की सामान्य सीमा के भाग से होकर (अर्थात् करकट्टा कोलियरी की पट्टा धृति सीमा से भाग से होकर) जाती है।

डी-ए लाइन नवाडीह ग्राम के भू-खण्ड सं० 207, 160 और 162 से होकर जाती है और आरम्भ-बिन्दु 'ए' पर मिलती है।

[का० सं० 25(27)/73-सी 5/मैस]

एस० आर० ए० रिजवी, उप-सचिव

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 19th July 1975

S.O. 2747.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Steel and Mines (Department of Mines) No. S.O. 234 dated the 9th January, 1974, under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 121.75 acres (approximately) or 49.75 hectares (approximately) of the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification.

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in the said lands;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the lands measuring 121.75 acres (approximately) or 49.75 hectares (approximately) described in the Schedule appended hereto.

2. The plans of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi (Bihar) or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1-Council House, Calcutta or in the office of the National Coal Development Corporation Limited, (Revenue Section) Darbhanga House, Ranchi (Bihar).

3. The Coal Controller, 1-Council House Street, Calcutta has been appointed by the Central Government as the competent authority under the Act.

SCHEDULE

(Karkatta Colliery Extension)

Block I

North Karanpura Coalfield.

DRG. No. Rev/10/75

Dated 25-3-75

(Showing land to be acquired)

All Rights

Sl. No.	Village	Thana	Thana number	District	Area in acres	Remarks
1.	Nawadih	Burmu	4	Ranchi	121.75	Part
					Total area :—	121.75 acres (approximately)
					or	49.75 hectares (approximately)

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Nawadih :—

160(p), 161(p), 162(p), 206(p) and 207(p).

Boundary Description :—

A-B line passes through plot numbers 162, 161 & 207 of village Nawadih.

B-C line passes through plot numbers 207, 206 and again 207 of village Nawadih.

C-D line passes along the part common boundary of village Nawadih and Tumand (i.e. along the part lease hold boundary of Karkatta Colliery).

D-A line passes through plot numbers 207, 160 and 162 of village Nawadih and meets at starting point 'A'.

[F. No. 25(27)/73-C5/CEL]

S.R.A. RIZVI, Dy. Secy.

(विद्युत विभाग)

(Deptt. of Power)

नई दिल्ली, 5 अगस्त, 1975

New Delhi, the 5th August, 1975

का० प्रा० 2748.—भारतीय विद्युत नियमावली, 1956 के नियम 5 के साथ पठित नियम 1 क द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भूतपूर्व सिन्हाई और विद्युत मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या ई० एल०-2-4 (5)/73, दिनांक 27 नवम्बर, 1973 का प्रतिफलन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा केन्द्रीय बिजली प्राधिकरण के निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों को, भारतीय विद्युत अधिनियम, 1910 (1910 का 9वाँ) के अधीन विभिन्न संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों और केन्द्रीय सरकार के विद्युत प्रतिष्ठानों के लिए नियुक्त केन्द्रीय विद्युत निरीक्षक की सहायता करने के लिए अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है, अर्थात् :-

1. श्री ईश कुमार, उप निदेशक
2. श्री बी० सी० घोष, उप निदेशक
3. श्री बी० एम० रेड्डी, उप निदेशक
4. श्री बी० के० जैन, उप निदेशक
5. श्री ए० बी० देशपांडे, सहायक निदेशक
6. श्री एम० बी० पारथासारथी, सहायक निदेशक
7. श्री टी० के० नाथ, सहायक निदेशक
8. श्री एन० रामा लिंगम, सहायक निदेशक
9. श्री बी० एम० खेड़ा, प्रतिरिक्त सहायक निदेशक
10. श्री एस० दत्त चौधरी, प्रतिरिक्त सहायक निदेशक
11. श्री बी० नागस्वामी, प्रतिरिक्त सहायक निदेशक
12. श्री मनोरंजन लाल, प्रतिरिक्त सहायक निदेशक

[संख्या ई०एल०-2-4(5)/73]

एम० पी० जैन, उप-निदेशक

S.O. 2748.—In exercise of the powers conferred by rule 4A read with rule 5 of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1956, and in supersession of the erstwhile Ministry of Irrigation and Power Notification No. E.L. II-4(5)/73 dated the 27th November, 1973 the Central Government hereby appoints with immediate effect and until further orders, the following officers of the Central Electricity Authority to be the officers to assist the Central Electrical Inspector for various Union Territories and Central Government electric installations, appointed under Section 36 of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 (9 of 1910), namely:—

1. Shri Ish Kumar, Deputy Director.
2. Shri B. C. Ghosh, Deputy Director.
3. Shri B. M. Reddy, Deputy Director.
4. Shri V. K. Jain, Deputy Director.
5. Shri A. V. Deshpande, Assistant Director.
6. Shri M. P. Parthasarthy, Assistant Director.
7. Shri T. K. Nath, Assistant Director.
8. Shri N. Ramalingam, Assistant Director.
9. Shri V. S. Kerra, Extra Assistant Director.
10. Shri S. Dutta Choudhury, Extra Assistant Director.
11. Shri V. Nagaswami, Extra Assistant Director.
12. Shri Manoranjan Lal, Extra Assistant Director.

[No. EL. II-4(5)/73]

S. P. JAIN, Deputy Director.

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 5 अगस्त, 1975

का० प्रा० 2749.—इसके साथ लगी प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियम के उपबन्ध के अन्तर्गत जारी किये गये निदेशों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई की सिफारिशों पर विचार करने के बाद, एतद्वारा, इसके साथ लगी द्वितीय अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्मों को उनके सभी भारतीय भाषाओं में रूपान्तरों सहित, जिनका विवरण प्रत्येक के सामने उक्त द्वितीय अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है :-

प्रथम अनुसूची

- (1) चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37वाँ केन्द्रीय अधिनियम) की धारा 12 की उपधारा (4) तथा धारा 16.
- (2) बम्बई सिनेमा (अधिनियम) अधिनियम 1953 (1953 का 11 वाँ बम्बई अधिनियम) की धारा 5 उपधारा (3) तथा धारा 9.

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की लम्बाई 35 मि० मि०	आवेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा संबंधी फिल्म है या समाचार या सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म है या जाकु-मेन्टी फिल्म है।
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 282.	241.00 मीटर	सूचना और जन-सम्पर्क महानिदेशक, महाराष्ट्र सरकार	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म (महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए)।	

1	2	3	4	6	6
2. महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 283.	295.00 मीटर	सूचना और जन-सम्पर्क महानिदेशक, महाराष्ट्र सरकार	समाचार और सामयिक		
		फिल्म सेंटर तारवेव रोड, बम्बई।	घटनाओं की फिल्म		
			(महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में		
			प्रदर्शन के लिए)।		
3. एस० टी० अमुच्या घमची।	288.04 मीटर	महाराष्ट्र स्टेट रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट कारपोरेशन, बाल एम जोस-	शिक्षा संबंधी, (महाराष्ट्र		
		लेकर, 7/6 शिवाजी नगर, बॉली, बम्बई-25	सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के		
			लिए)।		

[फा० सं० 6/1/75-एफ०(पी०) परिशिष्ट-2000]

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

ORDER

New Delhi, the 5th August, 1975

S. O. 2749—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provisions of the enactments specified in the First Schedule annexed hereto the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Second Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their language versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said Second Schedule.

FIRST SCHEDULE

- (1) Sub-section (4) of the Section 12 and Section 16 of the Cinematography Act, 1952 (Central Act XXXVII of 1952).
 (2) Sub-Section (3) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Bombay Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Bombay Act, XI of 1953).

SECOND SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length 35 mm	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Whether a Scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news & current events or a documentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Maharashtra News No. 282		241.00 Metres	Director General of Information and Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Films Centre, 68-Tardeo Road, Bombay-24.		News & current events (For release in Maharashtra Circuit)
2. Maharashtra News No. 283		295.00 Metres	-do-		-do-
3. S.T. Amuchya Ghamachi		288.04 Metres	Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation, Bal M. Joslekar, 7/6 Shivaji Nagar, Worli, Bombay-25.		Educational (For release in Maharashtra Circuit).

[F. No. 6/1/75-F(P) App. 2000]

आदेश

फा० सं० 2750.—इसके साथ लगी पहली अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियम के उपबंध के अन्तर्गत जारी किये गये निर्देशों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई की निवारणों पर विचार करने के बाद, एतद्वारा इसके साथ लगी द्वितीय अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई गुजराती फिल्मों को, जिनका विवरण प्रत्येक के सामने उक्त द्वितीय अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया गया है, स्वीकृत करती है :—

प्रथम अनुसूची

- (1) चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37वां केन्द्रीय अधिनियम) की धारा 12 की उपधारा (4) तथा धारा 16.
 (2) बम्बई सिनेमा (विनियम) अधिनियम, 1953 (1953 का 17वां बम्बई अधिनियम) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (3) तथा धारा 9.

द्वितीय अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की लम्बाई 35 मि.मि०	आवेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा संबंधी फिल्म है या समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म है या डाकुमेन्ट्री फिल्म है
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. महिती चित्र संख्या 204.		274.32 मीटर	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, गांधी नगर।		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म (केवल गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये)।
2. कच्छ दर्शन		274.32 मीटर	—तदेव—		शिक्षा संबंधी (केवल गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये)।
3. महिती चित्र संख्या 205.		289.56 मीटर	—तदेव—		'समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म (केवल गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये)।

[फाइल संख्या 6/1/75-एफ० (पी०) परिशिष्ट-2001]
सूरज भाम गुप्ता, प्रवर सचिव

ORDER

S. O. 2750.—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provisions of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the film/films specified in column 2 of the Second Schedule annexed hereto in Gujarati to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said Second Schedule.

FIRST SCHEDULE

- (1) Sub-Section 4 of Section 12 and Section 16 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (Central Act XXXVII of 1952).
(2) Sub-Section 3 of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Bombay Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Bombay Act XVII of 1953).

SECOND SCHEDULE

S. No.	Title of the film	Length 35 mm	Name of the Applicant	Name of the Producer	Whether a Scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news & current events or a documentary film.
1. Mahitichitra No. 204		274.22 Metres	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhi Nagar.		Film dealing with news & current events (For release in Gujarat circuit only).
2. Mahitichitra No. 205		289.56 Metres	-do-	-do-	-do-
3. Kutch Darshan		274.32 Metres	-do-		Educational (For release in Gujarat circuit only).

[F. No. 6/1/75-F(P) App. 2001]

S. B. Gupta, Under Secy.

(विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 1975

का० प्रा० 2751.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधि-भोगियों की बेवखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 2 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो सरकार का राजपत्रित अधिकारी है, इस अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए संपदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है और यह भी निदेश देती है कि उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में की तत्सम्बन्धी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थानों के प्रयोगों की बाबत, इस अधिनियम द्वारा या इसके अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग और अधिरोपित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा।

सारणी

अधिकारी का पदाभिधान	सरकारी स्थान के प्रयोग
1	2
उप निदेशक (प्रशासन) सर्वेक्षण, भारतीय सर्वेक्षण (सी०एस० टी० प्रशिक्षण संस्थान, भारतीय सर्वेक्षण, हैदराबाद।	और एम० पी०) उपपल, हैदराबाद के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन भवन तथा अन्य सरकारी संपत्ति।

[का० सं० 8-18/75 सर्वे-2]

टी० एस० विष्णुनाथन, अवर सचिव

(DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY)

New Delhi, the 6th August, 1975

S.O. 2751.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 2 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being a Gazetted officer of Government, to be an estate officer for the purposes of the said Act and further directs that the said officer shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on an estate officer by or under the said Act in respect of the category of public premises specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

Designation of officer	Category of public premises
1	2
Deputy Director (Administration), Survey Training Institute, Survey of India, Hyderabad.	Buildings, as well as other Government properties under the administrative control of the Survey of India, (CST&MP), Uppal, Hyderabad.

[File No. 8-18/75-Sur. 2]

T. L. VISWANATHAN, Under Secy.

उद्योग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

(नागरिक और पूर्ति सहकारिता विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 5 अगस्त, 1975

का० प्रा० 2752.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, अग्रिम संविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के अधीन वि आगरा मर्चेंट्स चैम्बर लि०, आगरा द्वारा मान्यता के पुनर्वीकरण के लिए दिए गये आवेदन पर बायदा बाजार आयोग से परामर्श करके, विचार कर लेने पर, और अपना यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में और लोक हित में भी होगा, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त चैम्बर को गुड़ की अग्रिम संविदाओं की बाबत 10 अगस्त, 1975 से 9 अगस्त, 1976 तक (जिसमें ये दोनों दिन भी सम्मिलित हैं) की एक वर्ष की अनिश्चित कालावधि के लिए मान्यता प्रदान करती है ?

2. एतद्वारा प्रदत्त मान्यता इस शर्त के अध्वधीन है कि उक्त चैम्बर बायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय-समय पर दिए जाने वाले निदेशों का अनुपालन करेगा।

[फाईल सं० 12(10) आई०टी०/75]

यू० एस० राणा, उप-सचिव

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY & CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Department of Civil Supplies & Cooperation)

New Delhi, the 5th August, 1975

S.O. 2752.—The Central Government having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, the application for renewal of recognition made under Section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952) by the Agra Merchants' Chamber Limited, Agra, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Chamber for a further period of one year from the 10th August, 1975 to the 9th August, 1976 (both days inclusive) in respect of forward contracts in gur.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Chamber shall comply with such directions as may from time to time be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(10)-IT/75]

U. S. RANA, Dy. Secy.

(प्रौद्योगिक विकास विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 अगस्त, 1975

का० प्रा० 2753.—आवश्यक वस्तु अधिनियम, 1955 (1955 का 10) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, टायर और ट्यूब (संचालन नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1974 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित आदेश करती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इस आदेश का नाम टायर और ट्यूब (संचालन नियंत्रण) संशोधन आदेश, 1975 है।

(2) यह तुरन्त प्रवृत्त होगा।

2. टायर और ट्यूब (संचालन नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1974 के खण्ड 4 में, उप खण्ड (1) में, "कोई अन्य अधिकारी" शब्दों के पश्चात्, "जो नागरिक पूर्ति निरीक्षक की पंक्ति से नीचे का न हो" शब्द जोड़े जाएंगे।

[सं० 2/20/75—एल प्रार जी]

एस० बी० सुब्रामणियन, अवर सचिव

(Department of Industrial Development)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th August, 1975

S.O. 2753.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (10 of 1955), the Central Government hereby makes the following Order further to amend the Tyres and Tubes (Movement Control) Order 1974, namely :—

1. (1) This Order may be called the Tyres and Tubes (Movement Control) Amendment Order, 1975.

(2) It shall come into force at once.

2. In clause 4 of the Tyres and Tubes (Movement Control) Order, 1974, in sub-clause (1), after the words "any other officer", the words, "not below the rank of an Inspector of Civil Supplies", shall be inserted.

[No. 2/20/75-LRG]

S. B. SUBRAMANIAN, Under Secy.

(भारतीय मानक संस्था)

नई दिल्ली, 25 जुलाई, 1975

क्र० आ० 2754.—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विज्ञान) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 3 के उपविनियम (2) और (3) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में जिन मानकों के व्योरे दिए गए हैं, 28 फरवरी, 1975 को निर्धारित किए गए हैं:

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	निर्धारित भारतीय मानक की पद संख्या और शीर्षक	नए भारतीय मानक द्वारा रद्द किए हुए भारतीय मानक की पद संख्या और शीर्षक	विवरण
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	*IS:1308-1974 एल्ड्रिन धूलन पाउडर की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS:1308-1958 एल्ड्रिन धूलन पाउडर की विशिष्टि	*भा० मा० संस्था प्रमाणन विज्ञान योजना कार्यों के लिए IS:1308-1974, 1 अगस्त, 1975 से लागू हो जाएगा।
2.	IS:1699-1974 खाद्य रंगों की बानगी लेने तथा परीक्षण की पद्धतियां (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	(1) IS:1699 (भाग 1)-1963 कोलतार खाद्य रंगों की बानगी लेने तथा परीक्षण की पद्धतियां भाग 1 और (2) IS:1699 (भाग 2)-1963 कोलतार खाद्यरंगों की बानगी लेने तथा परीक्षण की पद्धतियां भाग 2।	

इन भारतीय मानकों की प्रतियां बिक्री के लिए भारतीय मानक संस्था, मानक भवन, 9-बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110001 और इसके शाखा कार्यालयों: अहमदाबाद, बंगलोर, बम्बई, कलकत्ता, हैदराबाद, कानपुर, मद्रास और पटना में उपलब्ध हैं।

[संस्था सीएमडी/13:2]

(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 25th July, 1975

S.O. 2754.—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-rule (2) of Rule 3 and sub-regulations (2) and (3) of regulations 3 of Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules & Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been established on 28th February, 1975 :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and Title of the Indian Standard Established	No. and Title of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Remarks
1	2	3	4
1.	*IS : 1308-1974 Specification for Aldrin Dusting Powders (first revision)	IS : 1308-1958 Specification for Aldrin Dusting Powders	*For purposes of ISI Certification Marks Scheme, IS : 1308-1974 shall come into force with effect from 1 Aug. 1975.

1	2	3
2. IS : 1699-1974 Methods of sampling and test for food colours (first revision)	(i) IS : 1699 (Pt. I)-1963 Methods of sampling and test for coal-tar food colours Part I and (ii) IS : 1699 (Pt. II)-1963 Methods of sampling and test for coal-tar food colours Part II.	

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Indian Standard Institution, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110001 and also its branch offices at Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bombay, Calcutta, Chandigarh, Hyderabad, Kanpur, Madras and Patna.

[No. CMD/13:2]

का० भा० 2755—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विन्ह) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 3 के उपविनियम (2) और (3) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में जिन मानकों के न्यौरे दिए गए हैं, 31 मार्च, 1975 को निर्धारित किए गए हैं :—

अनुसूची

क्रम	निर्धारित भारतीय मानक	भारतीय मानक द्वारा रदद किए हुए
संख्या	पदसंख्या और शीर्षक	भारतीय मानक की पदसंख्या और शीर्षक
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. IS:1925-1974 बोल्टों की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)		IS:1925-1970 बोल्टों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)
2. IS:2486 (भाग 2)-1974 1000 बोल्ट से अधिक संकेतिक बोल्टता वाली शिरोपरि पावर लाइनों के रोधक फिटिंग की विशिष्टि भाग 2 माप सम्बन्धी अपेक्षाएं (पहला पुनरीक्षण)		IS:2486 (भाग 2)-1963 3.3 किवो और उससे ऊपर की शिरोपरि पावर लाइनों के रोधक फिटिंग की विशिष्टि भाग 2 माप सम्बन्धी अपेक्षाएं
3. IS: 2486 (भाग 3)-1974 1000 बोल्ट से अधिक संकेतिक बोल्टता वाली शिरोपरि पावर लाइनों के रोधक फिटिंग की विशिष्टि भाग 3 ताला लगाने के साधन		
4. IS:5346-1975 कोलतार खाद्य रंगों के संकय और मिश्रणों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)		IS:5346-1969 कोलतार खाद्य रंगों के संकय और मिश्रणों की विशिष्टि

इन भारतीय मानकों की प्रतियां बिक्री के लिए भारतीय मानक संस्था, मानक भवन, 9-बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110001 तथा इसके शाखा कार्यालयों: अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, बम्बई, कलकत्ता, हैदराबाद, कानपुर, मद्रास और पटना में उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं० सी० एम० डी०/13:2]

S.O. 2755—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-rule (2) of Rule 3 and sub-regulations (2) and (3) of regulations 3 of Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which are given in the Schedule here to annexed, have been established on 31 March, 1975:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and Title of the Indian Standard Established	No. and Title of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any superseded by the new Indian Standard
1	2	3
1.	IS:1925-1974 Specification for Bldts (second revision)	IS:1925-1970 Specification for Bldts (First revision)

- IS:2486 (Pt. II)-1974 Specification for insulator fittings for overhead power lines with a nominal voltage greater than 1000 V Part II dimensional requirements (first revision)
- IS:2486 (Pt. III)-1974 Specification for insulator fittings for overhead power lines with a nominal voltage greater than 1000 V Part III locking devices.
- IS:5346-1975 Specification for coaltar food colour preparations and mixtures (first revision)
- IS:2486 (Pt. II)-1963 Specification for insulator fittings for overhead power lines of 3.3 KV and above part II dimensional requirements.

Copies of the Indian Standards are available for sale with the Indian Standards Institution, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110001 and also its branch offices at Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bombay, Calcutta, Chandigarh, Hyderabad, Kanpur, Madras and Patna.

[No. CMD/13:2]

नई दिल्ली, 4 अगस्त, 1975

का० प्रा० 2756.—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिन्ह) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उप विनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन लाइसेंसों के ध्येरे नीचे धनसूची में दिए गए हैं, लाइसेंसधारी का कार्य असंतोषजनक होने के कारण 20 जून, 1975 से रद्द कर दिए गए हैं :

धनसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या और तिथि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया	तत्सम्बन्धी भारतीय मानक संख्या
1.	सीएम/एल-4169 30-1-1975	मैसर्स शिवालिक ऐग्रो केमिकल्स, छात किशनपुरा, चंडीगढ़ राजपुरा रोड (पंजाब)	बीएचसी पायसनीय तेजद्रव	IS:632-1972
2.	सीएम/एल-4170 30-1-1975	मैसर्स शिवालिक ऐग्रो केमिकल्स, छात किशनपुरा, चंडीगढ़ राजपुरा रोड (पंजाब)	डीडीटी पायसनीय तेजद्रव	IS:633-1956
3.	सीएम/एल-4171 30-1-1975	मैसर्स शिवालिक ऐग्रो केमिकल्स, छात किशनपुरा, चंडीगढ़ राजपुरा रोड, (पंजाब)	एल्ड्रिन पायसनीय तेजद्रव	IS:1307-1958
4.	सीएम/एल-4172 30-1-1975	मैसर्स शिवालिक ऐग्रो केमिकल्स, छात किशनपुरा, चंडीगढ़ राजपुरा रोड (पंजाब)	मालाथियोन पायसनीय तेजद्रव	IS:2567-1973
5.	सीएम/एल-4173 30-1-1975	मैसर्स शिवालिक ऐग्रो केमिकल्स, छात किशनपुरा, चंडीगढ़ राजपुरा रोड (पंजाब)	डायमिथोएट पायसनीय तेजद्रव	IS:3903-1966
6.	सीएम/एल-4174 30-1-1975	मैसर्स शिवालिक ऐग्रो केमिकल्स, छात किशनपुरा, चंडीगढ़ राजपुरा रोड (पंजाब)	एन्ड्रिन पायसनीय तेजद्रव	IS:1310-1958
7.	सीएम/एल-4175 30-1-1975	मैसर्स शिवालिक ऐग्रो केमिकल्स, छात किशनपुरा, चंडीगढ़ राजपुरा रोड (पंजाब)	एंडोसल्फेन पायसनीय तेजद्रव	IS:4323-1967

[सं०एमडीडी/55:4170]

ए० के० गुप्ता, उप-महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 4th August, 1975

S.O. 2756—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations, 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby notifies that the licences, particulars of which are given below, have been cancelled with effect from 20 June, 1975 as the performance of the licensee was unsatisfactory :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Name and address of the licensee	Articles/Process covered by the licence	Relevant Indian Standards
1.	CM/L-4169 30-1-1975	M/s. Shivalik Agro Chemicals, Chhat Chandigarh, Rajpura Road (Punjab).	Kishanpura, BHC Emulsifiable Concentrates	IS : 632-1972
2.	CM/L-4170 30-1-1975	M/s. Shivalik Agro Chemicals, Chhat Chandigarh, Rajpura Road (Punjab).	Kishanpura, DDT Emulsifiable Concentrates	IS : 633-1956
3.	CM/L-4171 30-1-1975	M/s. Shivalik Agro Chemicals, Chhat Chandigarh, Rajpura Road (Punjab).	Kishanpura, Aldrin Emulsifiable Concentrates	IS : 1307-1958
4.	CM/L-4172 30-1-1975	M/s. Shivalik Agro Chemicals, Chhat Chandigarh, Rajpura Road (Punjab).	Kishanpura, Malathion Emulsifiable Concentrates	IS : 2567-1973
5.	CM/L-4173 30-1-1975	M/s. Shivalik Agro Chemicals, Chhat Chandigarh, Rajpura Road (Punjab).	Kishanpura, Dimethoate Emulsifiable Concentrates	IS : 3903-1966
6.	CM/L-4174 30-1-1975	M/s. Shivalik Agro Chemicals, Chhat Chandigarh, Rajpura Road (Punjab).	Kishanpura, Endrin Emulsifiable Concentrates	IS : 1310-1958
7.	CM/L-4175 30-1-1975	M/s. Shivalik Agro Chemicals, Chhat Chandigarh, Rajpura Road (Punjab).	Kishanpura, Endosulfan Emulsifiable Concentrates	IS : 4323-1967

[No. MDD/55 : 4170]

A.K. GUPTA, Deputy Director General.

पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय

(पेट्रोल विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 1975

का० प्रा० 2757.—तेल उद्योग (विकास) नियम 1975 के नियम 3 के उपनियम (1) के साथ पठित, तेल उद्योग (विकास) अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 47) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1), (3) और (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा भारत सरकार पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) के ता० 10 जनवरी, 1975 की सं० एस प्रो 26 (ई) की अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्—

उक्त अधिसूचना के पैराग्राफ 2 में, "भगले आदेश जारी होने तक पद पर कार्य करते रहेंगे" शब्दों के स्थान पर शब्दों, आंकड़ों और अक्षर, "13 जनवरी, 1975 से 2 वर्ष की अवधि तक कार्य करते रहेंगे" को रखा जाएगा।

[सं० आईएस-48020/3/74 प्रो एन जी-III]

आर० एन० चोपड़ा, भवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS

(Deptt. of Petroleum)

New Delhi, 15th July, 1975

S.O. 2757.—In exercise, of the powers conferred by sub-sections (1), (3) and (4) of section 3 of the Oil Industry (Development) Act, 1974 (47 of 1974), read with sub-rule (1) of rule 3 of the Oil Industry (Development) Rules, 1975, the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of petroleum and Chemicals (Department of Petroleum) No. S.O. 26 (E), dated the 10th January, 1975, namely :—

In the said notification, in paragraph 2, for the words "hold office until further orders", the words, figures and letter "hold office for a period of 2 years with effect from the 13th January, 1975" shall be substituted.

[No. IS-48020/3/74-ONG II]

R. N. Chopra, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 4 अगस्त, 1975

का० प्रा० 2758.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य से के० टी० सी० से जी० जी० एम० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पाखण्ड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है;

अतः, अब पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है :

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, भकरपुरा

रोड बरोदा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कुर सकेगा,

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चित. यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सूचनाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

डी एस के टी सी रे जी जी एस तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात

जिला : काभिरा

तालुका : बोरसाद

गांव	सर्वेक्षण सं०	हेक्टर	ए आर	सेन्टियर
			घई	
देहवान	992	0	06	38
	993	0	00	90
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	00	42
	816	0	14	77
	817	0	02	10
	818	0	00	84
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	00	42
	782	0	05	40
	787	0	03	84
	780	0	21	12
	778	0	18	48
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	00	72
	593	0	08	40
कन्कापुरा	598	0	10	08

[संख्या 12016/9/75 एन एच एस]

New Delhi, the 4th August, 1975

S.O. 2758.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D.S. KTC to GGS in Gujarat State, pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

2. And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto:

3. Now Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the petroleum pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of User therein:

4. Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9;

5. And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

For laying pipeline from D.S. KTC to GGS.

State:Gujarat	District : Kaira	Taluka : Borsad		
Village	Survey No	Hectare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5
Dehwan	922	0	06	38
	993	0	00	90
	Cart Track	0	00	42

	2	3	4	5
	816	0	14	77
	817	0	02	10
	818	0	00	84
Cart Track	0	00	42	
782	0	05	40	
787	0	03	84	
789	0	21	12	
778	0	18	48	
Cart Track	0	00	72	
593	0	08	40	
Kankapura	598	0	10	08

[No. 12016/9/75-L&L]

का० प्रा० 2759—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में 10 लाईन्स को जी० जी० एस-कम-सी० टी० एफ० कादी तक प्रत्यार्जन के लिए पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

2. और अतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एनर्वावद्ध अनुसूची से अर्जित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है;

3. अतः अत्र पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है ;

4. बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड बरोदा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा;

5. और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

10 लाईन्स को जी० जी० एस० कम-सी०-टी० एफ० कादी तक प्रत्यार्जन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने सम्बन्धी उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : मेहसाना	तालुका : कादी		
गांव	सर्वेक्षण नं०	हेक्टर ए आर ई	सेप्टियर	
चालासन	71	0	09	00
	93/बी	0	41	00

[संख्या 12016/10/5/74-एल एण्ड एल]

S.O. 2759.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum for diversion of 10 lines to GGS-Cum-CTF KADI in Gujarat State, pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

2. And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

3. Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of User therein:

4. Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9;

5. And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Acquisition of Right of User for laying Pipeline for Diversion of 10 Lines to GGS- cum-CTF KADI.

State: Gujarat	District: Mehsana	Taluka : Kadi		
Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Ac	Centiare
CHALSAN	71	0	09	00
	93/P	0	41	00

[No. 12016/10/75 L&L]

का० प्रा० 2760.—यतः पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० प्रा० सं० 3417 तारीख 16-12-74 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था;

और यतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी के अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और आगे यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अब अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है;

और, आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निवेश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में विहित होने के बजाय तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग में, सभी संघकों से मुक्त रूप में, इस अधिनियम के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

प्रतिसूची

नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय

जी एस इन के—66 से जी जी एस तक और ओ यू के साथ जोड़े हुये जी एस एन के—59 से जी जी एस लाइन तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये ।

(परिवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 5 अगस्त, 1975

राज्य : गुजरात	ज़िला : मेहसाना	तालुका : मेहसाना/वीरमगम		
गाँव	सर्वेक्षण सं०	हेक्टर	ए और ई	सेटीनियर
महमदपुर	9	0	15	29
बलसासन	105/3	0	02	40
	106/1	0	04	68
	106/2	0	03	48
कार्ट-ट्रैक		0	00	84
	162/1	0	15	64

[सं० 12016/17/75-एल एण्ड एल]

टी०पी० सुब्रह्मनयन, प्रवर सचिव

S.O. 2760.—WHEREAS by a notification of the Govt. of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals (Department of Petroleum) S.O. No. 3417, Dated 16-12-74 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines.

AND WHEREAS the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

AND FURTHER WHEREAS the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

NOW THEREFORE in exercise of the Power conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipelines;

AND FURTHER in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil & Natural Gas Commission free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

For laying pipe line from D.S.NK-59 to GGS line connecting with R.O.U. from D.S. NK-66 to GGS.

State: Gujarat District : Mehsana Taluka : Mehsana/Viramgam

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Are	Centiare
MEHMADPURA	9	0	15	29
BALSASAN	105/3	0	02	40
	106/1	0	04	68
	106/2	0	03	48
Cart-track		0	00	84
	162/1	0	15	64

[No. 12016/17/74-L&L]

T.P. SUBRAHMANYAN, Under Secy.

का० प्रा० 2761 यतः कलकत्ता डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1970 में संशोधन करने के लिए स्कीम का कतिपय प्रारूप डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा यथापेक्षित भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 2522, तारीख 17 सितम्बर, 1974 के अधीन, भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खण्ड 3 उपखण्ड (ii), तारीख 28 सितम्बर, 1974 में पृष्ठ 2812 पर, प्रकाशित किया गया था ; जिसमें उन सभी व्यक्तियों से जिनका उससे प्रभावित होना सम्भाव्य था राजपत्र में उक्त अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से दो मास की अवधि के अवसान तक आक्षेप और सुझाव मांगे गये थे ;

और यतः उक्त राजपत्र 12 अक्टूबर, 1974, को या उसके आसपास जनता को उपलब्ध करा दिया गया था ;

और यतः उक्त प्रारूप पर जनता से कोई आक्षेप और सुझाव केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्राप्त नहीं हुए हैं ;

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार कलकत्ता डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम 1970 में संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित स्कीम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इस स्कीम का नाम कलकत्ता डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) तृतीय संशोधन स्कीम, 1975 है ।

(2) यह राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होगी ।

2. कलकत्ता डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1970 में—

(1) खण्ड 23 के उपखण्ड (1) में से निम्नलिखित शब्दों का लोप कर दिया जायेगा अर्थात्:

“और साथ-साथ बोर्ड में ऐसी फीसों का निक्षेप करेगा जो इस निमित्त विहित की जाएँ” ;

(2) खण्ड 51 के उपखण्ड (5) में से निम्नलिखित शब्दों का लोप कर दिया जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“तथा ऐसी अपील में पारित आदेश अन्तिम और निश्चायक होगा”,

(3) खण्ड 52 में :—

(i) उपखण्ड (1) में,

(क) मब (क) में “तथा उपाध्यक्ष का आदेश अन्तिम तथा निश्चायक होगा और उसके विरुद्ध कोई अपील नहीं होगी ।” शब्दों के स्थान पर “तथा उपाध्यक्ष विनिश्चय करेगा” शब्द रखे जाएँगे ;

(ख) मब (ख) में “खण्ड 48 के उपखण्ड (1) की मब (ii) की उपमब (क) के अधीन किसी आदेश के विरुद्ध किसी अपील की दाखल अवधि का आदेश अन्तिम और निश्चायक होगा और उसके विरुद्ध कोई अपील नहीं होगी” शब्दों, कोष्ठकों, अक्षर और अंकों के स्थान पर,

"खण्ड 48 के उपखण्ड (i) की मद (ii) की उपमद (क) के अधीन किसी आदेश के विरुद्ध अपील अवश्य ही की जा सकेगी तथा अध्यक्ष उसका विनिश्चय करेगा," (ii) उपखण्ड (2) में "केन्द्रीय सरकार का आदेश अन्तिम और निष्कायक होगा और उसके विरुद्ध अपील नहीं होगी" शब्दों के स्थान पर" केन्द्रीय सरकार अपील में ऐसा आदेश करेगी जैसा वह उचित समझे," शब्द रखे जाएंगे;

(4) खण्ड 55 के उपखण्ड (2) में,—

(क) मद (i) की उपमद (ख) के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित परन्तुक अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

"परन्तु उपमद (ख) के अधीन नियोजक का नाम नियोजक को सुनवाई का युक्तियुक्त अवसर दिए बिना नहीं हटाया जाएगा।";

(ख) मद (ii) की उपमद (ङ) के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित परन्तुक अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

"परन्तु उपमद (घ) के अधीन सेवा का ऐसा पर्यवेक्षण, या उपमद (ङ) के अधीन ऐसी पद्धति कर्मकार को सुनवाई का युक्तियुक्त अवसर दिये बिना नहीं की जाएगी।"

[एस० 70012/7/74-पी एण्ड डी/एल डी]

वी० संकरालिंगम, धरम सचिव

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi, the 5th August, 1975

S.O. 2761.—Whereas certain draft scheme to amend the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1970, was published as required by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948) at page 2812 of the Gazette of India, Part II, section 3, sub-section (ii), dated the 28th September 1974 under the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing), No. S.O. 2522, dated the 17th September, 1974 inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, till the expiry of period of two months from the date of publication of the said notification in the Official Gazette;

And whereas the said Gazette was made available to the public on or about the 12th October, 1974;

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said draft by the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following scheme to amend the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1970, namely:—

1. (1) This Scheme may be called the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Third Amendment Scheme, 1975.

(2) It shall come into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1970,—

(i) In sub-clause (1) of clause 23, the following words shall be omitted, namely:—

"and simultaneously deposit with him such fees as may be prescribed in this behalf,";

(ii) in sub-clause (5) of clause 51, the following words shall be omitted, namely:—

"and the order passed on such appeal shall be final and conclusive";

(iii) in clause 52—

(1) in sub-clause (1),—

(a) in item (a), for the words "whose order shall be final and conclusive and there shall be no appeal against it.", the words "who shall decide the same" shall be substituted;

(b) in item (b), for the words, brackets, letter and figures "The order of the Chairman in respect of an appeal against an order under sub-item (a) of item (ii) of sub-clause (1) of clause 48 shall be final and conclusive and there shall be no appeal against it.",

the words, brackets, letter and figures "An appeal against an order under sub-item (a) of item (ii) of sub-clause (1) of clause 48 may be preferred to the Chairman who shall decide the same", shall be substituted;

(II) In sub-clause (2), for the words "The order of the Central Government shall be final and conclusive and there shall be no appeal against it", the words "The Central Government shall make such order on the appeal as it thinks fit", shall be substituted.

(iv) in sub-clause (2) of clause 55,—

(a) after sub-item (b) of item (i), the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:—

"Provided that no such removal under sub-item (b) shall be made except after giving the employer a reasonable opportunity of being heard";

(b) after sub-item (c) of item (ii), the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:—

"Provided that no such termination under sub-item (d), or dismissal under sub-item (e) shall be made except after giving the worker a reasonable opportunity of being heard."

[File No. S. 70012/7/74-P&D/LD]

V. SANKARALINGAM, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 5 अगस्त, 1975

का०आ० 2762—यतः दिल्ली नगर निगम के प्रतिनिधि श्री निहाल सिंह और श्री जोगिन्दर नाथ को दिल्ली परिवहन निगम को सलाह देने के प्रयोजन के लिए भारत सरकार के मौखिक और परिवहन मंत्रालय, परिवहन पक्ष की अधिसूचना संख्या 15-टी० ए० जी० (15)/72 दिनांक 7 जनवरी, 1975 को गठित सलाहकार परिषद् के सदस्य नियुक्ति किये गये हैं।

2. और यतः उक्त श्री निहाल सिंह और श्री जोगिन्दर नाथ, दिल्ली नगर निगम के प्रतिनिधि नहीं रहे हैं।

3. अब यतः दिल्ली परिवहन (सलाहकार परिषद्) नियम 1973 के नियम 3 और 7 के साथ पठित सड़क परिवहन निगम अधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 64) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त सदस्यों की सदस्यता समाप्त

करती है और उक्त अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

"उक्त अधिसूचना में मद 8 और 9 और तत् संबंधी प्रविष्टियां लुप्त कर दी जाएं"।

[संख्या 15-टी० ए० जी० (15)/75]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 5th August, 1975

S.O. 2762.—Whereas Shri Nihal Singh and Shri Joginder Nath, representatives of the Municipal Corporation of Delhi, have been appointed as members on the Advisory Council constituted for the purpose of advising the Delhi Transport Corporation by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. 15-TAG (15)/72 dated the 7th January, 1975;

And whereas the said Shri Nihal Singh and Shri Joginder Nath have ceased to be the representatives of the Municipal Corporation of Delhi;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Road Transport Corporations Act, 1950 (64 of 1950) read with rule 3 and rule 7 of the Delhi Transport (Advisory Council) Rules, 1973, the Central Government hereby terminates the membership of the above-said members and further makes the following amendment in the above-said notification, namely :—

"In the said notification, items 8 and 9 and the entries relating thereto shall be omitted."

[No. 15-TAG(15)/72]

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 1975

क्र० प्रा० 2763.—सड़क परिवहन निगम अधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 64) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार, नौबहन परिवहन मंत्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना सं० सा० प्रा० 255 (ई) दिनांक 2 मई, 1973 में और संशोधन करने के लिये निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में पहले पैरा में, मद (ii) तथा तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टियों को हटा दिया जाये।

[सं० 15 टी० ए० जी० (35)/73]

एन० आर० रेड्डी, संयुक्त सचिव,

New Delh, the 6th August, 1975

S.O. 2763.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Road Transport Corporations Act, 1950 (64 of 1950), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment further to amend the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. S.O. 255 (E), dated the 2nd May, 1973, namely :—

In the said notification, in the first paragraph, item (xi) and the entries relating thereto shall be omitted. And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable the said workmen entitled?

[No. 15-TAG (35)/73]

N. R. REDDY, Jt. Secy.

पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली 5 अगस्त, 1975

क्र० प्रा० 2764.—वायुयान नियम 1937 के नियम 3 के उप-नियम (2) का अनुसरण करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय के आदेश संख्या क्र० प्रा० 2547, दिनांक 8 सितम्बर, 1973 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त आदेश की अनुसूची में, क्रम सं० 8 तथा उससे संबंध प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित क्रम संख्या तथा प्रविष्टियां जोड़ी जाएंगी, अर्थात् :—

1	2	3
---	---	---

"9, अनुसूची 8 का पैरा 6 इंडियन एयरलाइंस तथा एयर इंडिया दोनों ही के विमानचालकों को अनुसूची 8 के पैरा 6 के उपबन्धों के प्रयत्न से छूट देना।"

[क्र० सं० ए० जी०-11016/2/74-ए०आर० (1937) (2)/1975]

एस० एकांबरम्, उप-सचिव,

MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION

ORDER

New Delhi, the 5th August, 1975

S.O.2764.—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of rule 3 of the Aircraft Rules, 1937, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation No. S.O. 2547, dated the 8th September, 1973, namely :—

In the Schedule to the said Order, after Serial No. 8 and the entries relating thereto, the following Serial No. and entries shall be inserted, namely :—

1	2	3
---	---	---

"9. Paragraph 6 of Schedule VIII. To exempt pilots of both the Indian Airlines and Air India from the operation of the provisions of paragraph 6 of Schedule VIII."

[F. No. Av. 11016/2/74-A/AR(1937)(2)/1975]

S. EKAMBARAM, Dy. Secy.

श्रम मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 30 मई, 1975

क्र० प्रा० 2765.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायद्व अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के बारे में पंजाब नेशनल बैंक से संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री के० एन० श्रीवास्तव होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय कानपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण की न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या पंजाब नेशनल बैंक के प्रबंधकों को 29 अक्टूबर, 1973, की, जिस दिन ईव थी, कार्य करने के लिए अपने कर्मचारियों को अतिकाल भत्ता देने से इनकार करने की कार्यवाही न्यायचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हक्का हैं ?

[सं० एल-12011/6/75-डी-2/ए]

आर० कुंजीषापायम, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

ORDER

New Delhi, the 30th May, 1975

S.O. 2765.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Punjab National Bank and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri K. N. Srivastava shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Kanpur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of the Punjab National Bank in denying overtime to its employees for working on the 29th October, 1973, being Id, is justified? If not to what relief are the said workmen entitled?"

[No. L. 12011/6/75-DII/A]

New Delhi, the 8th August, 1975

S.O. 2766.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Calcutta, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Mercantile Bank Limited, Calcutta and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th August, 1975.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
CALCUTTA

Reference No. 1 of 1975

Parties :

Employers in relation to the Mercantile Bank Limited,
Calcutta.

AND

Their Workmen

Appearance:

On behalf of Employers.—Shri A. K. Bhawmik, Advocate
On behalf of Workmen.—Shri D. P. Roy.

State : West Bengal

Industry : Banking

AWARD

By Order No. L. 12012/130/74/LRUI, dated 23rd December, 1974, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Mercantile Bank Limited, Calcutta, and their workmen to this Tribunal, for adjudication. The reference reads as follows :

"Whether Shri Bibhuti Bhusan Sen, a clerk in Messrs Mercantile Bank Limited, Calcutta has performed the duties of Head Clerk from the 9th March, 1974 onwards? If so, is he entitled to special allowance in terms of the Bipartite Settlement dated the 19th October, 1966?"

2. Shri Bibhuti Bhusan Sen, the workman in this case joined as a clerk in the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking

Corporation at one of its Calcutta branches on 15-1-1946. On 1-10-1972 the bank was merged with the Mercantile Bank Limited while the workman continued to serve the bank as a clerk at 31, Dalhousie Square branch, Calcutta. During his period of service he has been attached to the Current Accounts Department. That department was under the control and supervision of a Senior Officer, who was examined on the management's side as DW-1, Shri Rash Behari Dutta. There were two junior officers under him one of whom Shri N. N. Das was examined for workman as PW-3. There was a Head clerk in that department, one Sudhakrishna Kumar, examined as PW-2. The workman, PW 1, was an ordinary clerk who worked in the same department under PWs 2, 3 and DW-1.

3. The workman's case is that due to his long service and experience in the current account department he was deputed to work in the Head clerk's post since 9th March, 1974 while the incumbent of that post Sudhakrishna Kumar (PW 2) was on other duty as junior officer in that bank in the resultant vacancy caused by the transfer of the junior officer, Sri N. N. Das (PW 3) to a permanent post to 8, Netaji Subhas Bose Road branch of the bank in Calcutta. It is alleged that PW 2 had begun taking training under PW 3 even long before his transfer in order to equip himself with the nature and details of the work as an officer, though PW 3 was transferred only with effect from 3-6-1974. So, the contention of the workman was that he had been working in the Head Clerk's desk with effect from 9-3-74 performing the duties of a Head clerk as laid down in Appendix B (Part I, XI) of the Bipartite Settlement dated 19-10-1966 under the guidance and instruction of the bank management. While he was working in that capacity, it is alleged that the bank withheld some portion of the work in order to deprive him of the special allowance which he would be entitled to get under the Rules. Yet, he continued to do the rest of the work of a Head Clerk for which he was entitled to special allowance as per paragraphs 5, 6, 5.7 and 5.8 of the Bipartite Settlement of 1966. In spite of repeated demands by the workman as well as by the Union of which he is a member for the payment of special allowance due to him, the bank refused to consider his legitimate claim. The attempted conciliation before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) having failed the union has taken up the case for adjudication. Hence this reference.

4. In paragraphs 3, 4 and 12 of the written statement of the employer bank dated 30-4-75 contention is raised that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the reference and that the Union which has now espoused the cause of the workman has no representative character, which according to the Bank would be sufficient circumstance to reject the reference at the outset. But neither evidence was adduced nor argument advanced by either of the parties at any stage of the proceeding of the reference in respect of these contentions. I hold that these contentions are deemed to have been given up by the parties.

5. The Bank, however, mentioned in rest of the paragraphs in the written statement that Shri Bibhuti Bhusan Sen has been working only as a clerk during the relevant period, though the bank gives functional allowance available to head clerk under the terms of the Bipartite Settlement 1966 to one clerk in each department. Whenever a Head clerk goes on leave, the clerk who is asked to officiate in his place is allowed special allowance pertaining to the post of the Head Clerk. Bank, however, alleges the said functional allowance to the Head clerk as stated above irrespective of the fact whether or not the Head clerk carries on the functions as enumerated in the Bipartite Settlement; but for paying such functional allowance the bank reserves the right to call upon the Head clerk to do any of the enumerated duties of Head clerk at any time if it is so required. The workman in this case was paid pro-rata allowance when he officiated as Head clerk while Head clerk Sri Kumar (PW 2) was on leave on a previous occasion. The bank stated that sometime in March 1974 certain routine clerical job which was previously assigned to PW 2 had been transferred to the workman but those jobs did not relate to the special functions attached to the Head clerk but they were of a routine clerical nature. According to them the workman did not perform the duties of a Head clerk and neither was he officiating in place of PW-2. The Bank denied that the workman started functioning as Head Clerk since 9th March, 1974 in place of PW 2. On other hand, they contended that

PW 2 has been working at all material times as Head clerk drawing his special allowance which pertains to his office and that the question of workman officiating in his place therefore does not arise at all. Hence the Bank stated that the claim for special allowance put forward by the workman is not sustainable.

6. In the additional written statement dated 7-5-75 the bank denied all the allegations which the Union made against the Bank in their written statement and contended that the workman did not work as Head clerk in place of PW 2 so as to enable him to claim a special allowance in terms of the Bipartite Settlement of 1966.

7. The only question that arises on the basis of the reference is whether the workman in question has performed the duties of a Head clerk from 9th March, 1974 onwards. If so, is he entitled to special allowance in terms of the Bipartite Settlement dated 19th October, 1966.

8. The claim for special allowance had engaged the attention of the adjudicators from time to time in respect of the employees of Banks. The All India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes), known as Sastry award specially refers to special allowance in Chapter X of their report at paragraph 161 onwards and prescribed certain rates of special allowance to Head clerks and other office bearers. The conclusion arrived in the Sastry award underwent some modifications at the National Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes) in the award of Shri Justice Kantilal T. Desai. In his report of June, 1962 paragraph 5.220 under the caption "Special Allowance" Desai award made a review of the orders made in Sastry award as regards special allowance and allowed further enhancement of the special allowance. It is specifically stated in paragraph 5.285 that special allowance prescribed in the Desai award would be in supersession of those prescribed in the Sastry award as modified. The rates of special allowance are specified in paragraph 5.282 of the Desai award. The question of special allowance again came up for consideration in the settlement arrived at between the Bank management and their workmen on 19th October, 1966. Special rates have been prescribed in paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the Bipartite Settlement. The terms and conditions for payment of special allowance are also provided in paragraphs 5.5 to 5.12 of the Bipartite settlement. It is not necessary to recapitulate the provisions of these paragraphs. It is sufficient to point out that the payment of special allowance in respect of a person performing the duties of Head clerk shall be made if the employee performs all or any of the duties specified in Clause I (xi) of Appendix B under Chapter V of the Bipartite Settlement. The head clerk's duties shown above involve:

- (i) Passing independently cash, clearing and transfer cheques, vouchers, etc. (whether credits or debits) up to and including Rs. 1,000; passing will include verification of signatures and scrutiny as to correctness of endorsements on and other particulars of such instruments. It will also include checking and initialling the relative entries in the respective books of accounts (including ledgers) if in any bank such practice is in existence at present.
- (ii) Checking of vouchers, drafts, pay orders, bill schedules, advices, pass books, statement of accounts, books of accounts (excluding ledgers) and interest, exchange, discount, brokerage calculations and initialling them by way of authenticating them for accuracy/correctness. Any eventual authorisation of this work wherever necessary under an existing procedure, shall be done by a superior.
- (iii) Primary coding and decoding of telegrams (except check cyphers or symbols) subjects to eventual authentication by a superior and checking and/or marking off confirmation/s acknowledgements of telegrams."

9. In the written statement of both the employers as well as the workmen it is specifically stated that the workman in question would be entitled to get special allowance only if it was established that he performed all or any of the duties of Head clerk as provided in Appendix B clause I (xi) of the Bipartite Settlement dated 19th October, 1966. It is in paragraph 8 of the written statement of the union that

they made reference as to the Appendix B, Part I (xi) of the Bipartite Settlement to enable the workman to get special allowance. The Bank had also stated both in their original written statement as well as in the Additional written statement that it is incumbent upon the workman to prove that he performed all or any of the duties specified in clause I (xi) of the Appendix B of Bipartite Settlement so as to entitle him to claim a special allowance. So, we have to examine the workman's case from the evidence on record as to whether he established that he had performed the duties of a Head clerk from 9th March, 1974 onwards.

10. The main evidence in the case on behalf of the workman was that of PW 2, the Head clerk of his department and that of PW-3, a Junior Officer. The workman himself was examined as PW 1. The evidence of PW 3 was totally against the workman's case. PW 3 in his evidence has categorically stated that Sri Kumar was working as Head clerk and Sri Sen was working as an ordinary clerk. When his attention was drawn to Clause I (xi) of Appendix B of the Bipartite Settlement, PW 3 stated that the workman did not do any of the works mentioned in clauses (i) and (ii) during the relevant period. The evidence of PW 3 was, therefore, not useful to the workman. However, there was the evidence of PW 2 who stated that after PW 3 was transferred with effect from 3rd June, 1974 from 31, Dalhousie Square branch office to 8, Netaji Subhas Road, branch office, Calcutta, he was directed to do some of the duties of PW 3 and that in his place the workman in question was employed to perform the duties of a Head clerk. PW 2 had given some details of the work which the workman had to do as a Head clerk while he himself was engaged in doing the work of an officer. However, PW 2 used to draw the Head clerk's allowance and he did not draw any other allowance for performing the duties and responsibilities of an officer. DW1, the Senior Officer in-charge, however, stated that both the workman as well as PW 2 had executed only some clerical jobs attached to the respective officers and that they were not given any assignment to do the officer's duties to be performed by PW 2 or Head clerk's duties to be performed by PW 1, the workman. DW 1 stated that the workman in this case is not entitled to any special allowance. In the light of above evidence we have to examine the case of the workman as to whether the duties and responsibilities which he had undertaken during the relevant period would come within the purview of clause I (xi) of Appendix B of the Bipartite Settlement.

11. The evidence of PW 1 was that as regards item (i) in clause I (xi) he was directed to vouchsafe the correctness of the signature and accuracy of the figures in all cheques presented at the branch specially in respect of cheques above Rs. 25,000/-. The bank has produced two books marked as Exts. M4 and M4(a) which will show that the workman made some entries in those books. But the workman had admitted that he dealt with the cheques only during the period from 9-3-1974 to 25-3-1974 as that work had been snatched away from him by the management when he made an oral claim for special allowance. Any way, his further case was that as regards item (ii) in clause I (xi) of Appendix B of the Bipartite Settlement, he was making calculations of the exchange in respect of both Inland and Foreign exchange bills and that the said work was allotted to him by the management while PW 2 was on other duties as an officer as a result of transfer of PW 3 from their branch office to another branch in Calcutta. Item (ii) referred to above includes exchange calculations. But it is admitted that it is not the responsibility or the duty of the Head clerk in-charge to initial such exchange bills after the exchange value was ascertained. Even DW 1 has admitted that it was not part of the duty of the Head clerk to initial an exchange calculation. However, DW 1 admitted that the workman in question had been making exchange calculations in respect of both inland and foreign exchange bills. It is also in evidence that PW 2 had to do some work attached to the office of PW 3 who was transferred. DW 1 did not specify in his evidence as to the workload which was given to PW 2 when he worked in place of PW3. DW1 admitted that PW2 had been asked to work in place of PW 3 but his case is that his work was limited to clerical nature of work. But no material had been produced by the bank to ascertain as to the clerical nature of his work nor the workload of PW 2 had been estimated. In the absence of clear evidence on the side of the management on the specific question one has to come to the conclusion that PW 2 had been deputed to carry on some

work which was formerly being done by PW 3. If PW 2 was engaged in the work of PW 3 it is to be inferred that somebody else had to do the work of PW 2 in the office. The management had no definite or clear case as to how the work of PW 2 was managed during his absence. They had no case that somebody else was employed in the place of PW 2. On the contrary, in paragraph 7 of the written statement the Bank states, "that in terms of the said Bipartite Agreement dated 19th October, 1966 as amended from time to time the Bank grants functional allowance available to Head Clerk under the said agreement to one clerk in each department. Whenever a Head Clerk goes on leave, the clerk who is asked to officiate in his place is allowed special allowance pertaining to the post of Head Clerk as stated above irrespective of the fact whether or not the Head Clerk carries on the functions as enumerated in the Bipartite Agreement; but paying such functional allowance the bank reserves the right to call upon the Head clerk to do any of the enumerated duties of Head clerk at any time if it is so required. "It is in evidence that on a previous occasion PW 1 had to perform the duties and responsibilities of a Head clerk when PW 2 was on leave and for that period he had been paid special allowance. The management's case that the workman need not be paid any special allowance unless he acts in place of the Head clerk whenever he goes on leave only, cannot be accepted. The Bipartite Settlement is definite that if any or all of the duties mentioned in clause I(xi) of Appendix B of Bipartite Settlement is performed by a person, he would be entitled to get the Head clerk's allowance. In paragraph 5.6 of the Bipartite Settlement, page 15, it is stated, "It would, however, not be necessary that a workman should continue to perform such duties or discharge such functions, whole time, in order to be entitled to such allowance". In paragraph 5.8 in the same page it is stated, "A workman will be entitled to a special allowance if he is required to perform duty/duties and/or undertake the responsibilities listed against the category, irrespective of his designation/nomenclature or any general authority vested in him." It is very clear from the evidence that the workman was employed to do certain duties and responsibilities of a head clerk specially when the Head clerk PW 2 was on other duty. The Bank does not maintain any record as to the work to be carried out by each of the employees in the bank. The Bank should have in a case like this maintained a register in respect of the work to be done by both the workman in question as well as PW 2. It is incumbent upon the bank to maintain such records. Paragraph 5.291 of Desai award provides that whenever a Bank requires an employee to work in a post carrying a special allowance it should be done by an order in writing to avoid any future controversy. This part of the report of Desai award has not been abrogated by the Bipartite Settlement of 19th October, 1966. It is unfortunate that this bank had no record of any kind to ascertain as to the nature of work which was performed either by the workman in question or by PW 2. DW 1 himself was not in a position to tell this tribunal as to the nature of work which was turned out by the workman as well as PW 2. He had listed their work and responsibility in a sheet of paper which was shown at the trial but neither the written statement nor any other record would show the nature of work which was allotted either to PW 1 or PW 2. From a reading of the entire evidence and the circumstances of the case, I am convinced that PW 1 the workman had been performing the work of a Head clerk in the 31 Dalhousie Square branch of the Bank. However, it is necessary to consider the period for which he would be entitled to the allowance.

12. There is a definite case of the workman that he started to work as Head clerk from 9-3-1974. The basis of his claim was that from 9-3-1974 PW 2 was deputed for training under PW 3 long before his transfer. There is no record to show that PW 2 had been deputed for training with effect from 9-3-1974. PW 3 and DW1 denied any such training period. As a matter of fact PW 3 was working in the office till 3rd June, 1974. So, it is for the workman to establish that in the absence of PW 2 undergoing training he was called upon to work as Head clerk from 9-3-1974. Except his word of mouth there was no other material before the tribunal to hold that he was deputed to work as a Head clerk from 9-3-1974. He would be entitled to get the Head clerk's allowance from the date of his letter dated 17-4-1974 which is marked as Ext. W1. He could not claim any special allowance from 9-3-1974. In terms of Bipartite Settlement he has to get special allowance from 17-4-1974; but the amount has to be limited to the period ending with the date

of reference i.e., 23rd December, 1974. It could not be said that after the controversy had arisen the Bank would have employed the workman to do the work of a Head clerk. So, for the period subsequent to 23-12-1974 the workman cannot claim any special allowance. The workman will get the special allowance available to Head clerk from 17-4-1974 to 23-12-1974 at the rates specified in the Rules.

13. Before closing this award, I may point out that the Bank should hereafter maintain a Register showing the work allotted to each of its officers from time to time in the light of the observations made in the Desai award which is referred to above in order to avoid future controversy. Direction may also be given to the workman as to the nature and scope of work he has to perform in the bank.

14. In the result, the reference is answered in favour of the workman granting him special allowance of a Head Clerk from 17th April, 1974 to 23rd December, 1974. In other respects the reference is rejected.

An award is passed accordingly.

E. K. MOIDU, Presiding Officer.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 28th July, 1975.

[No. L-12012/130/74-LRIII]

New Delhi, the 14th August, 1975

S.O. 2767.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank and their workmen, which was received by Central Government on the 7th August, 1975.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY.

Reference No. CGIT-5/of 1974.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Shri G. D. Maheshwari, Law Officer.

For the Workmen—Shri S. M. Dharap, Advocate.

STATE: Maharashtra.

INDUSTRY: Banking.

Bombay, the 7th July, 1975

AWARD

By order No. L-12012/46/74/LRIII dated 7-9-1974, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) referred to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule mentioned below:—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Allahabad Bank in terminating the services of Shri Sheshrao Bapurao Mawale, Cashier at their Chandrapur

Branch (Maharashtra State) is justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

2. Shri A. K. Deshmukh, President, Allahabad Bank Employees Union, on behalf of the workmen, states in his claim statement that :—

(i) Shri Sheshrao Bapurao Mawale was appointed at Chandrapur Branch of the Allahabad Bank on 12-3-1973 on a temporary basis in a permanent vacancy in place of one Shri Kashi Naresh Pandey, permanent cashier of the Branch whose services were terminated with effect from 12-3-1973. The Bank in order to circumvent the provisions of the Bank Awards (Desai and Sastri Awards) and Bipartite Settlement issued temporary orders for ten to fifteen days every time and the employee concerned worked upon 9-8-1973 with intermittent break of three days from 27-5-1973 to 29-5-1973. Although Shri Mawale was again appointed to work in the same vacancy from 20-12-1973 and was given extension upto 31-1-1974 he was not allotted work in Cash Department and his services were once again wrongfully terminated on 3-1-1974 without any justification. As per the directions of Desai and Sastri Awards and bipartite settlement, the workman must have been classified as a Probationer' by giving him six months probationary period from 12-3-1973 instead of treating him wrongfully as a temporary employee. The services of a probationary employee could not be terminated in the manner envisaged by the Bank.

(ii) The termination of services as on 26-5-1973 and 9-8-1973 and 3-1-1974 be declared as illegal and Shri Sheshrao Bapurao Mawale be reinstated in Bank's service. He be declared confirmed employee after completion of six months' probation from 12-3-1973 and the Bank be directed to pay and implement all the benefits provided for confirmed employee as per provisions of Award and Bipartite Settlement. He be granted back wages for the period of forced unemployment in between 12-3-1973 to 3-1-1974 and from 4-1-1974 onwards till the date of reinstatement in the Bank's service at the rate of Rs. 388.80 per month.

3. The Bank raised preliminary objections that the matter of dispute referred to this Tribunal is not a dispute much less an industrial dispute inter-alia on account of the following :—

(a) That the Bank employed Shri S. B. Mawale purely on temporary basis as a substitute against vacancies caused by the temporary absence of any permanent employees and/or to cope with some additional work, arising from time to time; therefore, the Bank had requisitioned the services of Shri S. B. Mawale with the stipulated condition that his services would automatically cease whenever his term under contract expired.

Therefore, at no point of time Shri Mawale has gained any status of an employee much less a confirmed employee and question of terminating the services of Shri Mawale as such, does not arise. Even after the date of the reference the Bank had requisitioned the services of Shri Mawale whenever such vacancies arose.

(b) That the alleged matter of dispute as referred vide Reference Order No. L/12012/46/74/LR-III dated 7th September, 1974 is very vague and does not indicate any particular date month or year about the alleged termination of services of Shri S. B. Mawale. Therefore, the said Reference Order is ultra vires and bad in law and also confers no jurisdiction to this Tribunal to adjudicate and/or to enter into the merits of the case.

(c) That the preliminary objections raised go to the root of the very jurisdiction of this Tribunal. Therefore in the interest of justice and fairness it would be better if the Tribunal decides first the above ob-

jections as preliminary objections in order to decide the jurisdiction of this Tribunal.

4. The reference was fixed for arguments on preliminary objections raised by the management, but the dispute was settled between the parties who have filed the settlement with a prayer that the Tribunal be pleased to pass an award in terms of settlement. On going through the settlement I find that the settlement is fair and reasonable and in no way prejudices the case of the workman. The settlement is accepted. Award is made in terms of settlement. Settlement dated 16-6-1975 Annexure 'A' is to form part of the Award. Parties to bear their own costs.

B. RAMLAL KISHEN, Presiding Officer

ANNEXURE 'A'

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, BOMBAY.

Reference No. CGIT-5 of 1974.

PARTIES :

Workmen of Allahabad Bank, Represented by,
Allahabad Bank Employees' Union, (Vidarbha Region).
C/o K. B. Mawale, 94, Hanuman Nagar, Nagpur-9.

PARTY 1.

VERSUS

The Management of Allahabad Bank.

PARTY 2.

MAY IT PLEASE THIS HONOURABLE TRIBUNAL.

The parties to the above dispute have arrived at an amicable settlement, in view of the fact that the concerned workmen has been appointed on probation with effect from 29th March 1975. The terms of settlement are as follows :—

1. Shri S. B. Mawale has been appointed on probation with effect from 29th March 1975 for period of 6 months.
2. The parties agree that this Tribunal will be Arbitrator in case services of Shri S. B. Mawale are to be terminated during the probationary period of 6 months as said above, and the Bank will seek a prior approval of this Honourable Arbitrator and his decision shall be final.
3. The Union agrees not to press for any wages of the period of dispute. The parties state that this dispute has been fully and finally resolved as per the above mentioned terms of settlement.

It is prayed that this Honourable Tribunal may be pleased to pass an award in terms of above settlement.

Bombay,

Dated : 16th June, 1975.

Sd/-

G. D. MAHESHWARI
For Allahabad Bank.

Sd/-

S. M. DHARAP, Advocate,
For Allahabad Bank Employees' Union (Vidarbha Region).
Sd/-

A. K. DESHMUKH, General Secy.

Allahabad Bank Employees' Union (Regd).
Workmen Party I

Sd/-

SHESHRAO BAPURAO MAWALE, Workmen Concerned
[No. L. 12012/46/74/LR-III]

* S.O. 2768.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay in respect of a complaint under Section 33A of the said Act filed by Shri R. T. Gulhane ex-employee of the Central Bank of India which was received by Central Government on the 7th August 1975.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT BOMBAY.

Complaint No. CGIT-3 of 1972

Arising out of Reference No. CGIT-9 of 1971.

PARTIES :

Shri R. T. Gulhane .. Complainant.

V/s

1. The Custodian,
Central Bank of India, Bombay-1.

2. The Chief Agent,
Central Bank of India, Nagpur-1. .. Respondents.

3. The Agent,
Central Bank of India, Chikhali.

APPEARANCES :

For the complainant—Shri S. P. Chaudhari, President,
Shri A. M. Puranik, Vice-President, Vidarbha Bank
Employees' Federation, Nagpur-2.

For the respondents—Shri G. R. Shaikh, Asstt. Law
Officer.

STATE : Maharashtra. INDUSTRY : Banking.

Bombay, the 7th July, 1975

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 by the complainant alleging that the respondents have been guilty of a contravention of the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act because his services were terminated during the pendency of reference No. CGIT-9 of 1971. According to the complainant he was appointed in the respondents Bank at its Chikhali Branch as a clerk on 24-2-1971 and his services were finally terminated on 26-5-1972 after a period of more than fifteen months continuous service with breaks of 3-4-days intermittently, though he was appointed in a permanent and in a clear vacancy. The complainant as per the provisions of Sastry and Desai Awards, is deemed to have been confirmed in the services of the Bank with effect from 23-2-1971 after completion of six months' continuous service in a permanent post and the order of termination giving 14 days notice pay is therefore illegal and in contravention of the provisions of the I.D. Act and the provisions of the Bank Awards and Bi-partite Settlements. The order of termination is illegal and liable to be set aside in the interest of justice.

2. The respondents raised preliminary objections alleging that the complaint is not maintainable in law because the Bank had not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act as alleged by the complainant and the complainant is in no way connected with the dispute referred for adjudication to this Tribunal which is marked as Ref. No. CGIT-9 of 1971. The termination of service of the complainant was done in accordance with the existing service conditions enjoined upon the parties by the subsisting contract of service. The termination of service of the complainant was not for any misconduct, as such no breach of clause 1(b) or 2(b) of Section 33 of the I.D. Act has been committed by the respondents. Without prejudice to the

preliminary issues it is submitted by the respondents that the complainant was not appointed in a permanent post or against a clear vacancy. The respondents also denied that the order terminating the services of the complainant contravenes the provisions of the Bank Award Bipartite Settlement and Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is denied by the respondents that the complainant was entitled to be confirmed in service with effect from 23-2-1971. The complaint be dismissed.

3. The representative of the complainant submits that the complainant wishes to withdraw the complaint. In view of this submission, the complaint is dismissed for non-prosecution. Award is made accordingly. No order as to costs.

B. RAMLAL KISHEN, Presiding Officer

[L. 12025/1/75-2(A)]

R. KUNJITHAPADAM, Under Secy.

भादेश

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 1975

का० प्रा 2769.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायद्व अनु-सूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में सेसस भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की कूरीडीह कोलियरी, झाकधर कलासगढ़, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्वेशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण संख्या 2, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्वेशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या सेसस भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की कूरीडीह कोलियरी, झाकधर कलासगढ़, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र की, श्री लालू महतो खनिक को 3 जून, 1974 से पदच्युत करने की कार्यवाही न्यायनिर्वेशित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[संख्या एल-20012/44/75-डी-3ए]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 18th July, 1975

S.O. 2769.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kooridih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Officer Katrasgarh, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule herto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Kooridih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Katrasgarh, District Dhanbad in dismissing Shri Lalu Mahata, Miner, with effect from 3rd June, 1974, is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-20012/44/75-D. IIIA]

प्रवेश

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1975

का० प्रा० 2770.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मेसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की पश्चिम मुदीडीह जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्ध कोलियरी, डाकघर सिजुआ तब से संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण संख्या 2, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मेसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की पश्चिम मुदीडीह कोलियरी, डाकघर सिजुआ, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र की, श्री अशोक कुमार पांडे, विद्युत सहायक को 18 मई 1974 से पदच्युत करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है। यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[संख्या एल-20012/60/75-डी-3ए]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1975

S.O. 2770.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of West Mudidih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Sijua, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of West Mudidih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Sijua, District Dhanbad, in dismissing Shri Ashok Kumar Pandey, Electric Helper, with effect from the 18th May, 1974 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-20012/60/75-D.-IIIA]

प्रवेश

का० प्रा० 2771.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मेसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की मण्डल केण्डवाडिह कोलियरी, डाकघर नवागढ़, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र से संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण संख्या 2, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या निम्नलिखित श्रमिकों का यह दावा है कि मेसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड की मण्डल केण्डवाडिह कोलियरी डाकघर-नवागढ़, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र द्वारा उन्हें उस कोलियरी में जबकि वर्ष 1972 में उस कोलियरी में खनन संक्रियाएं कार्य पुनः प्रारंभ की गई थी नियोजित किया जाना चाहिए था, मानने योग्य है ? यदि हाँ, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के और किस तारीख से हकदार हैं।

क्रमिक श्रमिकों के नाम

1. रिम्पू माहतो
2. रवि माहतो
3. वीरू माहतो
4. बलगोविन्द माहतो
5. गोबर्धन माहतो
6. रतीलाल माहतो
7. जानकी शर्मा
8. दुर्गा गोप
9. खलील भिया
10. चरकू माहतो
11. तपेश्वर सिंह
12. पंचू खीदास
13. एतवारी भुइया
14. सोहन भुइया
15. किशन भुइया
16. जगेष्वर चमार
17. केवल भुइया
18. अन्तू भुइया
19. जानकी सिंह
20. भारत माहतो
21. महेश मिश्र
22. रोहण रविदास
23. रामनारायण सिंह
24. बन्तू गोस्वामी
25. रामदी माहतो
26. आशुतोष गोस्वामी
27. पिबनाथ राम
28. अश्विनी कुमार गोस्वामी

क्रमिक श्रमिक का नाम

29. मुसाफिर राम
30. सालिगराम गोस्वामी
31. विजय रेवानी
32. ज्योति सिंह
33. किशन गोस्वामी
34. सरजू राम
35. गणेश रावानी
36. मोचीराम महतो
37. चन्नु महतो
38. मंशु गोस्वामी
39. राम प्रसाद
40. शारदा राजवार
41. मनपूरन गोस्वामी
42. सागर महतो
43. काबन्ध कामर
44. बीरू गोरार्ई
45. इब्राहीम मियां
46. इस्माइल मियां
47. माहन्वी माहतो
48. गुलजार मियां
49. राजबन्नीमियां
50. पनबाबू मियां
51. खलील मियां
52. छट्टन मियां
53. छट्टो मियां
54. जक्रीर मियां
55. गूजर गोरार्ई
56. दरकू राजवार
57. खुरशीद मियां
58. यासीन मियां
59. दामा माहतो
60. सुल्हामान मियां
61. नारायण गोप
62. धनी धोबा
63. छबीलाल धोबा
64. बुब लाल धोबा
65. गोपाल धोबा
66. सन्तोष धोबा
67. रसिक धोबा
68. प्रमूख धोबा
69. छकू धोबा
70. फागू धोबा
71. पंचू धोबा
72. गंगा राम धोबा
73. दूर्जा धोबा
74. निजर्जा धोबा
75. नेपाल धोबा
76. छट्टू धोबा
77. रघुनाथ धोबा
78. रूपलाल धोबा
79. लूणू माहतो

क्रमिक श्रमिक का नाम

80. भगतू महतो
81. जितू माहतो
82. बिसु माहतो
83. गणेश माहतो
84. बोधी महतो
85. बिनभासी महतो
86. दाती महतो
87. पूरन मांझी
88. सोमार महतो
89. बेनी महतो
90. बुधन सिंह
91. फेत्तुसिंह
92. विजयमाल सिंह
93. रामदेव मण्डल

[सं० एल-2012/144/73 एल धार-2/डी-3ए]

एल० के० नारायणन्, अनुभाग अधिकारी विशेष

ORDER

S. O. 2771.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Mandal Kendwadih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Nawagarh District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And Whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, constituted under Section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the claim of the undermentioned workmen that they should have been given employment in the Mandal Kendwadih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad by the management of that colliery when the mining operations in that colliery was restarted in the year 1972, is sustainable ? If so, to what relief are the said workmen entitled and from what date ?

Sl. Name of the workmen
No.

1. Rijhu Mahato.
2. Robi Mahato.
3. Biru Mahato.
4. Dalgobind Mahato.
5. Gobardhan Mahato.
6. Ratilal Mahato.
7. Janki Sharma.
8. Durga Gope.
9. Khalil Mian.
10. Charaku Mahato.
11. Tapayaswar Singh.
12. Panchu Rabidas.
13. Atwari Bhuiya.

Sl. No.	Name of the workmen	Sl. No.	Name of the workmen
14.	Sohan Bhuiya.	74.	Nirja Dhoba.
15.	Kishan Bhuiya.	75.	Nepal Dhoba.
16.	Jageswar Chamar.	76.	Chhutu Dhoba.
17.	Kewal Bhuiya.	77.	Raghu Nath Dhoba.
18.	Antu Bhuiya.	78.	Ruplal Dhoba.
19.	Janki Singh.	79.	Tulu Mahato.
20.	Bharat Mahato.	80.	Bhagtu Mahato.
21.	Maresh Mishra.	81.	Jitu Mahato.
22.	Rohan Rabidas.	82.	Bisu Mahato.
23.	Ramnarain Singh.	83.	Ganesh Mahato.
24.	Banu Goswami.	84.	Bodhi Mahato.
25.	Ramdeo Mahato.	85.	Bindyashi Mahato.
26.	Ashutosh Goswami.	86.	Dati Mahato.
27.	Shionath Ram.	87.	Puran Manjhi.
28.	Aswani Kumar Goswami.	88.	Somar Mahato.
29.	Musafir Ram.	89.	Beni Mahato.
30.	Saligram Goswami.	90.	Budhan Singh.
31.	Bijoy Rewani.	91.	Fetu Singh.
32.	Jyoti Singh.	92.	Bijaymal Singh.
33.	Kishan Goswami.	93.	Ramdeo Mondal.
34.	Sarju Ram.		
35.	Ganesh Rawani.		
36.	Mochiram Mohato.		
37.	Chandu Mahato.		
38.	Manshu Goswami.		
39.	Ramprasad.		
40.	Sarda Rajwar.		
41.	Manpuran Goswami.		
42.	Sagar Mahato.		
43.	Kalchand Kamar.		
44.	Biru Gorai.		
45.	Ibrahim Mian.		
46.	Ismail Mian.		
47.	Mahandi Mahato.		
48.	Guljar Mian.		
49.	Rajbali Mian.		
50.	Panbabu Mian.		
51.	Khalil Mian.		
52.	Chhutan Mian.		
53.	Chhuto Mian.		
54.	Jakir Mian.		
55.	Gujar Gerain.		
56.	Darku Rajwar.		
57.	Khurshid Mian.		
58.	Yasin Mian.		
59.	Dama Mahato.		
60.	Sulyaman Mian.		
61.	Narain Gope.		
62.	Dhani Dhoba.		
63.	Chhabilal Dhoba.		
64.	Bublal Dhoba.		
65.	Gopal Dhoba.		
66.	Santosh Dhoba.		
67.	Rasik Dhoba.		
68.	Amulya Dhoba.		
69.	Chhanku Dhoba.		
70.	Phagu Dhoba.		
71.	Panchu Dhoba.		
72.	Ganga Ram Dhoba.		
73.	Durja Dhoba.		

[No. L-2012/144/73-LR. II/DIIIA]

New Delhi, the 8th August, 1975

S.O. 2772.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2 Dhanbad, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Semra Colliery, West Bokaro Group of Collieries, P.O. Kuju Dist. Hazaribagh and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 7th August, 1975.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL NO. 2, DHANBAD

PRESENT

Shri K. K. Sarkar, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 29 of 1974

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Sec. 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Semra Colliery, West Bokaro Group of Collieries, P. O. Kuju, District Hazaribagh.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers : Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate.

On behalf of the Workmen : Shri J. D. Lall, Advocate.

State : Bihar

Industry : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 1st August, 1975

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, being of opinion that an Industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Semra Colliery, West Bokaro Group of Collieries, P. O. Kuju, Dist. Hazaribagh and their

workmen, by their Order No. L-2012/134/73-LR.II, dated 7.VI.1974 referred the same to this Tribunal under section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act for adjudication on the issue mentioned in the schedule below :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the Custodian, West Bokaro Group of Collieries P. O. Kuj, Dist. Hazaribagh was justified in removing from service Shri Noni Gopal Sarkar, Cashier, employed at Semra Colliery from the 7th March, 1973 ? If not, to what relief is the workmen entitled ?"

In this industrial dispute the terms of reference are two : (1) Whether the Custodian, West Bokaro Group of Collieries, P.O. Kuj, District Hazaribagh was justified in removing from service Shri Noni Gopal Sarkar, Cashier, employed at Semra Colliery from the 7th March, 1973. (2) If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ?

The case of the workmen is that Shri Noni Gopal Sarkar was a permanent Cashier in the above colliery. He fell sick and on the advice of Doctor he took leave from 10.4.1972 for treatment. In the mean time the colliery was taken over by the Central Government with effect from 31.1.1973 and subsequently nationalised with effect from 23.2.1973 (?). After recovering from illness the concerned workman reported for duty on 7.3.1973 to the Custodian but he was not allowed to resume his duty. This amounts to his removal from service. He made several representations to the higher authority which were no avail.

The case of the employer is that the reference is incompetent in that no industrial dispute was ever raised. Further as the provision of Section 2(5) of I.D. Act is in-applicable there is no valid reference according to law. It is submitted that Shri Sarkar worked upto 8-4-1972 and left the colliery without taking any leave. It is a simple case of his resigning his job.

The points taken by Shri J. D. Lall, learned Advocate, representing the workman are : (1) the plea of leave is supported by evidence on record, (2) Even if the concerned workman left his job, according to the Standing Order of the company, he has to be formally removed from the service.

(3) The substance of the dispute and not the form has to be considered, and refusal of employment amounts to removal from the service. The main points taken by the learned advocate, representing the company are : (1) It is not the case of removal from service and, as such, it is not maintainable under Sec. 2(a) of the I.D. Act. (2) The concerned workman left his job voluntarily which amounts to resignation.

First I take up the question if the concerned workman went on leave or he left his job voluntarily. The workman in support in his case says that he went on sick leave from 10th April, 1972 to 3rd March, 1973 and produced some credit vouchers to show that he got half-pay in respect of his leave from the month of April 10 onwards. The signature of the concerned workman appears on Revenue Stamp on the back of each of the vouchers (Ext.W-1 series). It appears that these credit vouchers were produced almost at the time of final hearing of the case before me. The workman had enough time to file the vouchers in proper time and there appears to be no satisfactory explanation as to why such important documents were not placed in proper time. These vouchers being very important for the purpose of the workman's case should have been produced in time and this late filing does inspire confidence in them. Accordingly I am not inclined to place reliance on these vouchers. Some papers purported to be leave application of the concerned workman with the endorsement of the owner of the colliery having granted him leave have also been filed very late. For the same reason I am not inclined to place any reliance on these documents. The only evidence is the oral evidence of the concerned workman who was examined as MW-1, who says that he worked in the colliery till 9.4.1972 and as he was suffering from low blood pressure and some stomach trouble, he took leave from the owner of the colliery and went away for treatment. He further says that in February, 1973 he became fit for work and submitted an application to the Custodian for

taking him back in job. In support of his plea of sickness the concerned workman produced a medical certificate from the Dr. A. N. Dutta dated 3.3.1973 (Ext. W-8). The certificate is to the effect that Shri Sarkar was under his treatment from 10th April, 1972 to 3rd March, 1973 as he was suffering from low blood pressure and jaundice with fever. This medical certificate has been much assailed by the learned advocate for the employers who submits that this has been procured subsequently to substantiate the false case of the concerned workman. It appears that the medical certificate bears the date which is prior to the date of his reporting for duty to the Custodian. The concerned workman remained absent for about one year on the ground of his illness and it is only reasonable to think that when he came back to resume his duty he would have produced medical certificate to the Custodian about his plea of illness, when he was not allowed to resume his duty by the Custodian. It appears that he did not produce the medical certificate to the Custodian's office. It does not speak well for the case of the concerned workman. The medical attendant who treated him and issued the medical certificate is not present before the Court to get the veracity of his certificate tested by the opposite side through cross-examination. This is all the available evidences coming from the side of the workman in support of his case. I may now see the other side of the picture. MW-1 was also a Clerk of Semra Colliery at the time of private management. He proved some statutory returns which are required to be sent by the colliery to the Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner. Ext.M-1 is the return of Provident Fund Members who left service during the quarter ending 30th June, 1972. It is duly signed by the Manager of Semra Colliery and this is of the relevant time. In the column under "date of termination of service" is written 10th April, 1972, than in the column under "reasons for termination of service" appears "willingly". The veracity of these return could not be successfully challenged and I have no reason to suspect the genuineness of these returns. It therefore appears from the returns filed by the old management before the Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner that the concerned workman willingly left his job on 10th April, 1972. Ext.M-9 is the leave register maintained by the old management. It appears therefrom that the leave taken by Shri Sarkar in January, February, March and April, 1972 have been duly shown as 26 days, 23 days, 26 days and 8 days respectively and from May the leave column has been shown blank. This register is not challenged because it is the register of the old management. If actually Shri Sarkar went on leave from 10th April, 1972 naturally this register would have been shown as "leave" during these months as it did for the months from January, 1972 upto 8th April, 1972. This supports the management's case that the plea of leave is false one and accordingly the concerned workman left his job. Then comes Bonus Register (Ext. M-10) and the bonus paid to Shri Sarkar has been shown upto February, 1972. MW-1 who was a co-worker of the concerned workman says in his evidence that Shri Sarkar worked in the colliery upto 8th April, 1972 and after that he never came to the colliery and he gave no leave application. Shri B. N. Roy was the owner of Semra Colliery before taking over and nationalisation and he has not been examined by the concerned workman to say that the concerned workman had gone on sick leave granted by him. Considering the evidence as above there is no doubt about it that the evidence coming from the side of the workmen is too weak to be relied upon and as a matter of fact all that I can say is that the concerned workman has failed to prove to the Court about his plea of sickness and about his going on leave. On the other hand the documentary evidence as supported by the oral evidence coming from the side of the management is more reliable. The learned advocate for the workman Shri J. D. Lall submits that even if it is accepted that the concerned workman left his job that does not serve the purpose of the management. His case is that if a workman according to the Standing Orders being a permanent employee, has to resign he has to give one month's notice and the temporary employee 15 days notice. This was not complied with. If a workman abandons his job or leaves his job with the consent of his employers, I do not think that he is required to be formally removed as a delinquent according to Standing Orders. If the requirement of notice before resignation is waived by the parties I do not think that the Tribunal can legitimately interfere in that matter. It is not the case of the workman that he left his job without permission. It is his case that he went on long leave with the permission of the management and the case has to be judged from that view point. The question remains whether he

went on leave granted by the management or he resigned the job or left the job which amounts to resignation. I am to choose between the two and there is no third case. I have considered the evidence carefully and the preponderance of the evidence is in favour of holding that the concerned workman left his job by resigning and not that he went on long leave because of his sickness. It is suggested from the side of the employers that as the owner Mr. B. N. Roy had also Mica business at Kodarma the concerned workman left the colliery and actually joined Mica business of Mr. Roy in Kodarma. He went on working there but in the meantime the coal industry was nationalised and the concerned workman wanted to come back to his old job and he invented the plea of sickness which can be of help to him. Of course I do not like making any comment on the above suggestion. It is also submitted from the side of the management that according to the Coal Mines Nationalisation Act the persons whose names appear on the rolls on the appointed day are to continue to work in the new management. Here the name of the concerned workman was not surely found on the rolls of the old management on the appointed day and therefore the new management was not required to take him back in job. There is great substance in the argument.

Now I come to the law point. Surely according to law it must be a case of discharge, dismissal or retrenchment of a workman so as to be an industrial dispute. The company concerned is the party to whom Shri Sarkar reported for duty. He had already left the job before nationalisation and after taking over and nationalisation the new employers did not give him job any more. The opposite party never themselves removed Shri Sarkar from service. On the basis of facts proved before me, he is not a person employed in the industry and so his case is not maintainable as such under Section 2(s) of I.D. Act. Then in view of the facts there could not have been any raising of industrial dispute.

In the facts and circumstances of the case the action of the West Bokakro Group of Collieries, P.O. Kujn, District Hazaribagh was justified and Shri Noni Gopal Sarkar (workman as described in the order of Reference) is entitled to no relief.

This is my award.

K.K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer.

[No. L. 2012/134/73/LRII/DIHA]

S.O. 2773.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2 Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in the relation to the management of Messrs A.J. Chanchani, Contractor, Bokaro Colliery, National Coal Development Corporation Ltd. List. Giridih and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 7th August, 1975.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD.

PRESENT:

Shri K. K. Sarkar, Judge, Presiding Officer
Reference No. 10 of 1974.

In the matter of an industrial dispute u/s 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs A. J. Chanchani, Contractor, Bokaro Colliery, National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post office Bermo, District Giridih.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the employers—Shri A. N. Chattr, Manager.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri Mansukhlal C. Maniar, the concerned workman.

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

Dhanbad, the 31st July, 1975

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs A. J. Chanchani, Contractor, Bokaro Colliery, National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post office Bermo, District Giridih and their workmen, by their order No. L-2012/153/73-LRII dated 1-2-74 referred the same to this Tribunal under S. 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, for adjudication on the issue mentioned in the schedule below:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Messrs A. J. Chanchani, contractor, Bokaro Colliery, National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post office Bermo, District Giridih was justified in transferring Shri Mansukhlal C. Maniar, Store-keeper to the establishment of Messrs Dhori Coal Sales Works from the 1st June, 1973 and thereafter stopping him from work from the 21st June, 1973? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

In this case the parties chose not to adduce any oral evidence or to prove any document formally. I have therefore to fall back upon the pleadings of the parties, their admissions. Admittedly the concerned workman was in the employment of M/s. A. J. Chanchani, contractors. It is admitted by the workmen in the pleadings that on 1-6-73 the concerned workman Shri Maniar was issued an order to the effect that his service had been transferred to Chanchani (Coal Sales) Private Ltd. and he should hand over the charge to Shri Roy. The copy of the said order has been made a part of the pleading as Annexure 'B'. Then it is the pleading of the workmen that the concerned workman protested against this transfer order on the ground of his long service and also on health ground and requested the management to allow him to continue in this old employment. The copy of the application of the concerned workman in this respect has been made a part of the pleading as Annexure 'C'. The next pleading of the workman is that the application of the workman was turned down by the employer by a letter which has been made a part of the pleading as Annexure 'D'. The pleading of the employer in this connection is that the concerned workman thereafter preferred to remain away from his duties from 7-6-73 and ultimately presented himself with a medical certificate on 22-6-73 alleging that he was under medical treatment. This part of the employer's case appears to have been admitted by the concerned workman as he says that he was on sick leave and on his resumption of his duties on 22-6-73 he was not allowed to join. No medical certificate has been proved before me nor the doctor who is alleged to have treated him was examined before me in support of the plea of illness of the concerned workman. It would therefore appear that the concerned workman's own admission in his pleadings is (1) that on 1-6-73 he was ordered to hand over key of the stores in which he was working to one Shri Roy as the concerned workman was transferred to another office of the employer, (2) that he made a request to the employer not to transfer him on the ground of his health and long service and (3) that the management turned down his request not to transfer him. The pleadings of the employers are that the concerned workman preferred to remain away from duty from 7-6-73 to 21-6-73. The case of the workman on the other hand is that he remained absent from duty from 13-6-73 to 21-6-73. As to how long the workman remained absent from duty has not been satisfactorily proved before me by either side, as no party chose to adduce any evidence. Anyway the workman remained absent from duty for 9/10 days or more. There is no evidence to show that the workman remained absent from duty on any leave granted to him or nothing has been produced before me or no satisfactory evidence has been adduced that the workman was sick during the period of his absence. So this period of his absence has not been legally accounted for. The case

on the management is that on 6-6-73 the workman without handing over the keys of the stores to one S. C. Roy threw away the same on the table and asked the manager to relieve him of his duties as he did not want to serve the concern any more. According to them this amounted to resignation and so he was not permitted to join his duties after the period of his absence. I now deal with the question of transfer of the workman to another office of the employers. An employer has the inherent right to transfer his employee from one office to another and the settled law is that the Court cannot interfere with such transfer unless there is mala fides on the part of the employer in this transfer or unless the workman suffers financial loss as a result of this transfer. The request of the workman to his employer was that he should not be transferred because of his long service and also on the ground of his health. This request did not find favour with the employer. Long service does not appear to be a good ground. Grounds of health have not been satisfactorily proved before me either by examining any medical practitioner or other evidence. I have no materials before me to hold that the employer should have cancelled his transfer order. I have no materials before me to hold that the transfer order was mala fide or that the workman stood to suffer any financial loss on account of the transfer. As transfer is a management function and as mala fides of the employer in such transfer are not proved, I cannot interfere with this management function of transfer. So my finding is that the management was not unjustified in the above transfer of the workman.

The next question is the action of the management in stopping the workman from work. The plea of the management is that the workman left his job on 6-6-73 which amounted to resignation. This part of the case of the management has not been sought to be proved by any evidence and so this cannot be accepted. The fact therefore boils down to this that the workman did not carry out the transfer order and thereafter he remained absent from his work for a number of days without leave granted, and then he came to join his duties. The management could have stuck to their earlier order of the workman's transfer to another office when he came to join but I do not understand how the management could have altogether stopped him from work of the company. If the management thought that the workman was guilty of misconduct either for not carrying out the transfer order or for some other reasons, the management was not without remedy in dealing with the workman. No standing orders have been produced and it is not the case of anybody that there are any standing orders of the company. It does not matter much where there are no standing orders and even where there are standing orders, the principles of natural justice must be observed before stopping a workman from his service which amounts to removing him from his job. The principles of natural justice dictate that before removing a workman from his job he must be given reasonable opportunity to show cause against such misconduct or removal and he must be given reasonable opportunity to defend the charge of misconduct. There is nothing to show that the management ever levelled any charge of misconduct against the workman or that the workman was given any opportunity to show cause against any misconduct or he was given opportunity to defend himself against any charge of misconduct. So it is very clear that the management did not follow the principles of natural justice in stopping the workman from his job which, to all intents and purposes amounts to removal or dismissal of the workman from service. That being so, the action of the management in stopping the workman from work cannot be sustained. By the way, I do not mean to say that the management was bound to cancel their transfer order or was bound to allow the workman to join in his old place of duty, but the management could not altogether stop him from work from the services of the company without observing the principles of natural justice. Naturally therefore the relief to the workman flowing from the unjustified action of the management in stopping him from the services of the company is that he should be reinstated in the services of the company. Another relief which arises for consideration is whether he should be paid back wages. The facts and circumstances of the case are somewhat peculiar. It does not appear from the case of the workman that he was ready to join his assignment on transfer and as a matter of fact the workman absented from duty without any proved lawful cause after his order of transfer. It does not also appear that the workman

offered to join at the place where he was transferred when he came to report for duty after his unauthorised absence. Naturally therefore though the company was not entitled to remove him from service of the company for his not carrying out the transfer order without taking disciplinary action against him according to law, the company could legitimately refuse to pay him wages till he carried out the order of the transfer and joined his new place of duty. The workman cannot have both the things, i.e. he would not join his new place of duty on transfer and at the same time he would claim wages without working in the place of his transfer. Therefore, in the peculiar circumstances of the case I am not inclined to give him any back wages.

In the result the management of Messrs A. J. Chanchani, Contractor, Bokaro Colliery, National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post office Barmo, District Giridih was justified in transferring Shri Mansukhlal C. Maniar, Store Keeper to the establishment of Messrs Dhori Coal Sales Works from the 1st June, 1973. But the action of the management in stopping the workman from work from 21st June, 1973 is not justified. The workman is therefore entitled to be reinstated in the services of the company. He is however not entitled to receive any back wages for reasons as stated in the body of my judgment.

This is my award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer

No. L. 2012/153/73/LRII/DHIA

L.K. NARAYANAN, Section Officer (Spl.)

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 1975

का० प्रा० 2774.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में भारतीय खाद्य निगम के प्रबंधन से सम्बन्धित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्वेशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्वेशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या भारतीय खाद्य निगम, कलकत्ता के प्रबंधन को, नीचे वर्णित 17 आकस्मिक कर्मचारियों को, उनके नामों के सामने बर्खास्त गये तारीखों से छंटनी करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मचारियों किस अनुसूची के हकदार हैं ?

नाम	छंटनी की तारीख
1	2
1. श्री बेबीबास बनर्जी	1-7-1974
2. श्री बीपक कुमार देश	1-7-1974
3. श्री प्रदीप कुमार सिल	1-7-1974
4. श्री तपन कुमार नाग	1-7-1974
5. श्री ज्योतिर्मय घटर्जी	1-7-1974
6. श्री श्याम सुन्दर नादो	1-7-1974
7. श्री जोहर लाल राय	1-7-1974
8. श्री मुकुंद राय	1-7-1974

1	2
9. श्री परितोष डे	1-7-1974
10. श्री देव ब्रत सेनगुप्त	1-7-1974
11. श्री खोकन दास गुप्त	1-7-1974
12. श्री अशोम कुमार सेनगुप्त	1-7-1974
13. श्री सुशील कुमार नाथ	1-4-1974
14. श्री बोरेंद्र नाथ सिंह	1-4-1974
15. श्री पञ्चू कायल	1-4-1974
16. श्री राधा पाद घोष	1-4-1974
17. श्री गोतम मुखर्जी	1-4-1974

[संख्या एल- 42012/1/75-डी 2 बी]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 19 July, 1975

S.O. 2774.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of the Food Corporation of India and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7-A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of the Food Corporation of India, Calcutta, in retrenching the under-mentioned 17 casual workmen with effect from the dates shown against their names, was justified? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled?

Name	Date of retrenchment
1. Shri Dobidas Banerjee	1-7-1974
2. Shri Dipak Kumar Deb	1-7-1974
3. Shri Pradip Kumar Sil	1-7-1974
4. Shri Tapan Kumar Nag	1-7-1974
5. Shri Jyotirmay Chatterjee	1-7-1974
6. Shri Shyam Sundar Nandy	1-7-1974
7. Shri Johar Lal Ray	1-7-1974
8. Shri Mukunda Ray	1-7-1974
9. Shri Paritosh Dey	1-7-1974
10. Shri Debabrata Sengupta	1-7-1974
11. Shri Khokan Dasgupta	1-7-1974
12. Shri Ashim Kumar Sengupta	1-7-1974
13. Shri Sushil Kumar Nag	1-4-1974
14. Shri Birendra Nath Singh	1-4-1974
15. Shri Panchu Kawal	1-4-1974
16. Sri Radha Pada Ghosh	1-4-1974
17. Shri Gautam Mukherjee	1-4-1974

[No. L-42012/1/75-D. IIB]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 जुलाई, 1975

का०आ० 2775.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाययुक्त अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में फतवाह-इस्लामपुर लाइट रेलवे कम्पनी लिमिटेड से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं० 1, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसेज फतवाह-इस्लामपुर लाइट रेलवे कम्पनी लिमिटेड, सैर-केन्टाइन बिल्डिंग्स, 9 लाल बाजार स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1 के प्रबंधन की, अपने प्रतिष्ठान में फतवा रेलवे स्टेशन से इस्लामपुर रेलवे स्टेशन तक 17-7-1975 को या उसके पश्चात् तात्कालिक धोषित करने की कार्रवाई, जैसी कि उसकी तारीख 2-7-1975 की सूचना में प्राशयित है, न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?

[संख्या एल-41011 (2)/75-डी 2 बी]

हरबंस बहादुर, अनुभाग अधिकारी (I श्रेण)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1975

S.O. 2775.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Futwah-Islampur Light Railway Company Limited and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal No. 1 Dhanbad, constituted under section 7-A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Messrs Futwah-Islampur Light Railway Company Limited, Mercantile Buildings, 9, Lal Bazar Street, Calcutta-1, in declaring lock-out in their establishment from Futwah Railway Station to Islampur Railway Station on or after 17-7-1975 as intended in their notice dated 2-7-1975, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?

[No. L-41011(2)/75-D. II B]

HARBANS BHADUR, Section Officer (Spl.)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 1975

का०आ० 2776.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाययुक्त अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसेज स्टार कन्स्ट्रक्शन एण्ड ट्रांसपोर्ट कम्पनी, संकारी, कन्ट्रैक्टर्स और मैसेज इंडिया सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड

संकारी से सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और चूना पत्थर खानों में उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 के और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी धिरू टी० पालानियाप्पन होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मद्रास में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसेज स्टार कन्स्ट्रक्शन एण्ड ट्रान्सपोर्ट कम्पनी, संकारी कन्ट्रैक्टर्स और मैसेज इंडिया सीमेण्ट्स लिमिटेड, संकारी के कर्मचारों की जो चूना पत्थर खानों में नियोजित है, निम्नलिखित मांगें व्यापक हैं यदि हाँ, तो वे किस अनुसूची के हकदार हैं ?

मांगें

- (1) कर्मचारों के लिए आवास की व्यवस्था ।
- (2) खानों में एक तुलाबोली की व्यवस्था ।
- (3) केन्द्रीय कर्मचारों का स्थाई किया जाना ।
- (4) कर्मचारों को धूल भत्ते का संवाय ।

[संख्या एल-29011/39/74-एल० आर०-4/डी प्रो० 3 बी]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 9th July, 1975

S.O. 2776.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Messrs Star Construction and Transport Company, Sankari, Contractors and Messrs India Cements Limited, Sankari, and their workmen in limestone mines in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Thiru T. Palaniappan as Presiding Officer with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the following demands of the workmen of Messrs Star Construction and Transport Company, Sankari, Contractors and Messrs India Cements Limited, Sankari and employed in limestone mines are justified? If so, to what relief are they entitled?

DEMANDS

- (1) Provision of housing accommodation to workmen.
- (2) Provision of a Weigh Bridge at quarries.
- (3) Permanency of canteen workers.
- (4) Payment of dust allowance to workmen.

[No. L-29011/39/74/LRIV-D.O. IIIB]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 जुलाई 1975

का० आ० 2777.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसेज बालानी स्टोन वर्क्स डाकघर पाकुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण संख्या 2 धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसेज बालानी स्टोन वर्क्स, पाकुर के प्रबन्धतंत्र की, अपनी मालाकारी पत्थर खान में मासिक दर वाले कर्मकार, श्री तिपा बसरा की सेवाएं 26 अप्रैल, 1974 से समाप्त करने की कार्रवाई व्यापकित थी ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है ?

[संख्या एल-29011/90/75-डी० प्रो० 3 बी]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th July, 1975

S.O. 2777.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Belani Stone Works, Post Office Pakur and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Messrs Belani Stone Works, Pakur in terminating the services of Shri Tipa Besra, monthly rated workman in their Malphari Stone mine with effect from the 26th April, 1974 was justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-29011/90/75-D.O. III. B]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 14 जुलाई, 1975

का० आ० 2778.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में श्री बनवारी लाल गुजर, भंडाना, जिला कोटा राजस्थान की कासार संख्या 2 नलुआ तलधर खान के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों

का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या श्री बनवारी लाल गुजर खान स्वामी मंडाना, जिला राजस्थान को कासार संख्या 2 बलुआ पत्थर खान में नियोजित कर्मचारों को, लेखा वर्ष 1971-72, 1972-73 और 1973-74 के लिए मजदूरी के 20% की दर से लाभ सहभाजन बोनस के संदाय के लिए मांग न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार इन वर्षों में से प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए कितने बोनस के हकदार हैं?

[संख्या एल-29011/54/75 बी० ओ० 3 बी०]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 14th July, 1975

S.O. 2778.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kasar No. 2 Sand Stone Mine of Shri Banwarilal Gujar, Mandana, District Kota, Rajasthan, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the demand of the workmen employed in Kasar No. 2 Sand Stone Mine of Shri Banwarilal Gujar, Mine Owner, Mandana, District Kota, Rajasthan, for payment of profit sharing bonus @ 20 per cent of wages for the accounting years 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74 is justified? If not, to what quantum of bonus are the workmen entitled for each of these years?

[No. L-29011/54/75-D.O. 3(B)]

प्रवेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 जुलाई, 1975

का० प्रा० 2779.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायुक्त अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में कोल माइन्स अथॉरिटी लिमिटेड की वेस्टर्न काजोरा कोलियरी, डाकघर रानीगंज, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ब) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या कोल माइन्स अथॉरिटी लिमिटेड की वेस्टर्न काजोरा कोलियरी, डाकघर रानीगंज जिला बर्दवान के प्रबंधन की, श्रीमती ललिता देवी, लोडिंग कामिन को 22 नवम्बर, 1973 से काम से रोकने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[संख्या एल-19012/6/75 बी० III (बी०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1975

S.O. 2779.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Western Kajora Colliery of Coal Mines Authority Limited, Post Office Rani-ganj, District Burdwan, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Western Kajora Colliery of Coal Mines Authority Limited, Post Office Rani-ganj, District Burdwan, in stopping Shrimati Lalita Devi, Loading Kamin, from work, with effect from 22nd November, 1973 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-19012/6/75/D. III(B)]

प्रवेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 1975

का० प्रा० 2780.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायुक्त अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स कोल माइन्स अथॉरिटी लिमिटेड की न्यू केन्वा कोलियरी, डाकघर तोपोसी, बर्दवान जिला से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ब) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स कोल माइन्स अथॉरिटी लिमिटेड की न्यू केन्वा कोलियरी डाकघर तोपोसी, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबंधन की, श्री एन० एन० पुरु-सांखी बिजली मिस्त्री को 1 अगस्त, 1973 से सेवा निवृत्त करने की कार्रवाई वैध और न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[संख्या एल-19012/2/75/बी० III (बी०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 1975

S.O. 2780.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the New Kenda Colliery of Messrs Coal Mines Authority Limited, Post Office Toposi, Burdwan district, and their workman in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of New Kenda Colliery of Messrs Coal Mines Authority Limited, Post Office Toposi, District Burdwan, in retiring Shri N. N. Puitandy, Electrician, with effect from 1st August, 1973 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-19012/2/75/D. III. B]

आदेश

का०आ० 2781.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाब्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स तिवारी झूमरलाल स्वरूप लाल, खान मालिक, करौली, जिला स्वाईमाधोपुर की कल्याणी, मचाना शोरपा बलुआ पत्थर खान के प्रबन्धतंत्र ने सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स तिवारी झूमरलाल स्वरूपलाल, खान मालिक, करौली, जिला स्वाईमाधोपुर की तहसील करौली में कल्याणी, मचानी, शोरपा बलुआ पत्थर खान में नियोजित कर्मकार, संवेतन राष्ट्रीय और त्वाहरी छुट्टियों की स्वीकृति के हकदार हैं ? यदि हां, तो किन छुट्टियों के लिए और किस वर्ष से ?

[संख्या एल-29011/47/75-डी० आ० III (बी)]

ORDER

S.O. 2781.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kalyani, Machani, Shorpa Sand Stone Mines of Messrs Tiwari Jhumarlal Swaroop Lal, Mine Owners, Karauli, District Sawaimadhopur, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the workmen employed in Kalyani, Machani, Shorpa Sand Stone Mines in Tehsil Karauli of Messrs Tiwari Jhumarlal Swaroop Lal, Mine Owners, Karauli, District Sawaimadhopur, are entitled for grant of paid notional and festival holidays? If so, for what holidays and from which year?

[No. L-29011/47/75-D.O. III. B]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 1975

का०आ० 2782.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाब्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में कोल माइन्स अथारिटी लिमिटेड की बहुला कोलियरी, डाकघर बहुला, जिला बर्दमान के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है -

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स कोल माइन्स अथारिटी लिमिटेड की बहुला कोलियरी, डाकघर बहुला, जिला बर्दमान के प्रबन्धतंत्र का (I) प्योर जामबाद यूनिट के श्री मूर्तजा अंसारी को धावरह पर्यवेक्षक के रूप में और (II) नार्थ जामबाद यूनिट के श्री राजनन्दन पाण्डेय को प्रधान क्षपरासी के रूप में, 31 जनवरी, 1973 से, पदाभिहित करने के लिए सहमत न होना न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

[संख्या एल-19012/18/74/एल आर II/डी० III बी]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th July, 1975

S.O. 2782.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Bahula Colliery of Coal Mines Authority Limited, Post Office Bahula, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Bahula Colliery of Messrs Coal Mines Authority Limited, Post Office Bahula, District Burdwan, is justified in not agreeing to designate (i) Shri Murtaza Ansari of Pure Jambad Unit as Dhawrah Supervisor and (ii) Shri Rajnandan

Pandey of North Jambad Unit as Head Chaprasi, both with effect from 31st January, 1973? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled?

[No. L-19012/18/74/LRII/D. III B]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 1975

का०प्रा० 2783.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स कोल माइन्स अथॉरिटी लिमिटेड की पांडावेश्वर कोलियरी, डाकघर पांडावेश्वर, जिला बर्दमान के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को व्याधिनियन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को व्याधिनियन के लिए निदेशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

म्या मैसर्स कोल माइन्स अथॉरिटी लिमिटेड की पांडावेश्वर कोलियरी, डाकघर पांडावेश्वर, जिला बर्दमान के प्रबन्धतंत्र का सर्वश्री (1) पूर्णदास; (2) जितन शान; (3) सूखु माझी; (4) सुलैमान शेख; (5) खारा माझी; (6) ओवन माझी; (7) गरीब माझी; (8) दिबा माझी; (9) निजाम; मिया और (10) महादेव दास, भराई मजदूर को 29 मार्च, 1974 से काम से रोकना व्याधिविहित है ? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

[सं० एल-19012/21/74/एल आर II/डी III की]

एस० एच० एस० अध्यक्ष, अनुभाग अधिकारी (विशेष)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th July, 1975

S.O. 2783.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Pandaveshwar Colliery of Messrs Coal Mines Authority Limited, Post Office Pandaveshwar, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Pandaveshwar Colliery of Messrs Coal Mines Authority Limited, Post Office Pandaveshwar, District Burdwan, are justified in stopping from work Sarvashri (i) Puran Das ; (ii) Jitan Gyan ; (iii) Sukhu Majhi ; (iv) Sulamon Sk. ; (v) Khara Majhi ; (vi) Chowan Majhi ; (vii) Garib Majhi ; (viii) Diba Majhi ; (ix) Nizam Mia and (x) Mahadeb Das, Stopping Mazdoor with effect from 29th March, 1974 ; If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled ?

[No. L-19012/21/74/LRII/D. III B]

New Delhi, the 12th August, 1975

S.O. 2784.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Selected Samla Colliery, Post Office Pandaveshwar, District Burdwan, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 30th July, 1975.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

Reference No. 3 of 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Selected Samla Colliery,

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Employers :

Sri N. Das, Advocate, with

Sri B. N. Lala, Asstt. Chief Personnel Officer.

Sri S. N. Mishra, -do-

Sri Onkar Singh, Industrial Relation Officer.

On behalf of Workmen : Absent.

Absent

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal Mines.

AWARD

By Order No L-19012/17/73-LRII, dated 2nd January, 1975, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Selected Samla Colliery and their workmen to this Tribunal, for adjudication. The reference reads as follows :

"Whether the management in relation to Selected Samla Colliery, Post Office Pandaveshwar, District Burdwan, is justified in dismissing Sarvashri Sudama Ahir and Rambehari Jadab, trammers with effect from the 2nd August, 1972? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

2. Notice of the reference was sent both to the management and the union of the workmen, Khan Shramik Congress which espoused the cause of the workmen. In response to the summons, the management appeared and filed their written statement. But, the workmen and their union were conspicuous by their absence and did not even file any written statement. The Tribunal fixed to-day for final hearing of the case and notice was issued accordingly to the union which was received by them and still they are absent to-day. The union and the workmen are therefore declared ex-parte.

3. The management contended in their written statement that the workmen had been justifiably dismissed after holding a proper domestic enquiry. On behalf of the management the Administrative Officer who held the domestic enquiry has been examined as a witness in the case. He has sworned to the fact that the workmen were dismissed by the management on the basis of Ext. M-1 series orders after a daily conducted domestic enquiry. The management was at perfect liberty to dismiss the workmen if they violated any of the terms of the Standing orders of the colliery. In the absence of any counter evidence the evidence on record has to be accepted. There is no ground to disbelieve the witness of the management. I, therefore, find that the dismissal of the workmen was justified in the circumstances of the case.

4. In the result, the reference is answered in favour of the management and an award is passed accordingly.

24-7-1975

E. K. MOIDU, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-19012/17/73/LRII/D. III. B]

S. H. S. IYER, Section Officer (Spl.)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 जुलाई 1975

का० आ० 2785.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिश्चित विषय के बारे में कल्याणराम अन्नक खान कालीचेडु, नेल्लोर जिला के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना प्रांशनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० नरसिंह राय होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा, और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

“क्या कल्याणराम अन्नक खान, कालीचेडु, नेल्लोर जिला के प्रबन्धतंत्र की, श्री वाल्लूरी शंकर रेड्डी, होएस्ट शहर को 22-7-1974 से पदच्युत करने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित थी ? यदि नहीं तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?”

[संख्या एल-28012/1/75-डी-4(बी)]

भूपेन्द्र नाथ, अनुभाग अधिकारी (विशेष)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1975

S.O. 2785.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kalyanrama Mica Mine, Kalichedu, Nellore District and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal, of which Shri T. Narasinga Rao shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Kalyanrama Mica Mine Kalichedu, Nellore District in dismissing Shri Valluri Sankara Reddy, Hoist Driver with effect from 22-7-1974 was justified ? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled ?”

[No. L-28012/1/75-D-IV(B)]

New Delhi, the 8th August, 1975

S.O. 2786.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 2), Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Kiriburu Iron Ore Mines of Messrs National Mineral Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Kiriburu, District Singhbhum and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7th August, 1975.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 23 of 1975

In the matter of an industrial dispute u/s. 19(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Kiriburu Iron Ore Mines of Messrs National Mineral Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Kiriburu, District Singhbhum

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers.—Shri S. K. Tah, Section Officer.

On behalf of the workman.—Shri Ajit Singh the concerned workman.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Iron Ore.

Dhanbad, the 2nd August, 1975

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kiriburu Iron Ore Mines of Messrs National Mineral Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Kiriburu, District Singhbhum and their workmen, by their order No. L-26012/5/74 LR-IV/D-IV(B), dated 4th March, 1975 referred the same to this Tribunal u/s. 10 (1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication on the issue as in the schedule below :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Kiriburu Iron Ore Mines of Messrs National Mineral Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Kiriburu, District Singhbhum is justified in removing Shri Ajit Singh, Heavy Vehicle Driver from service with effect from 14th February, 1974 ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?”

After the receipt of the order of reference from the Government of India the case was fixed for hearing on 19-4-75. The parties duly appeared and prayed for some time in prospect of a settlement and such time was allowed. Ultimately on 7-7-1975 both parties appeared and filed a joint petition of compromise settling the industrial dispute amicably. I heard both sides on the joint petition of compromise and it is submitted that an award be passed in terms of the settlement. The settlement appears to have been duly signed by the concerned workman, Shri Ajit Singh and by Shri G. L. Tandon, General Manager, Kiriburu Iron Ore Project for the employers. The terms of the settlement appear to be beneficial to the parties and nothing stands in the way of an award being passed thereon.

In the result, I pass an award in respect of the industrial dispute referred to on terms as embodied in the joint petition of compromise which do form part of the award as annexure A.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer.

ANNEXURE 'A'

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, DHANBAD

(Camp Calcutta)

Reference No. 23 of 1975—Ministry's Order No. L-26012/5/74-LR. IV/D-IV(B) dated 4-3-1975.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute between the Management of Kiriburu Iron Ore Project of M/s. National Mineral Development Corporation Ltd.... Management.

AND

Shri Ajit Singh, Ex-Heavy Vehicle Driver.....Workman.

The humble petition on behalf of the parties above named most respectfully Showeth.

1. That the parties to this proceeding have amicably settled their disputes.

2. That the workman does not now challenge validity and/or legality of the order of his removal from service with effect from 14-2-1974 passed by the management.

3. That the Management will pay a sum of Rs. 15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen thousand only) to workman. Shri Ajit Singh and the Workman will accept the aforesaid sum from the management in full and final settlement of his claims including all legal and statutory claims except Contributory Provident Fund dues against the management of M/s. National Mineral Development Corporation Ltd., Kiriburu Iron Ore Project.

4. That the workman aforesaid will have no further claim whatsoever against the management.

5. That the aforesaid sum will be paid by the management to the workman within one week from the date of receipt of Award.

6. That the workman will also vacate the quarter No. E-65/4 of the Company (M/s. National Mineral Development Corporation) at Kiriburu which is in his occupation and deliver vacant possession of the same to the management, before receiving the aforesaid payment.

7. That the parties will bear their own costs of this proceeding.

It is, therefore, prayed that Award may kindly be passed in terms of this compromise petition and the petition may kindly be formed a part of the Award: And for which the petitioners as in duty bound shall ever pray.

For and on behalf of Kiriburu Iron Ore Project of M/s. National Mineral Development Corporation Ltd.

Date : 6-7-1975.

G. L. TANDON, General Manager.

The signature of Shri G. L. Tandon is verified by me in the presence of the presiding Officer.

(S. K. Tah)

Section Officer (Trg).

Signature of the workman.

(Ajit Singh)

Ex-Heavy Vehicle Driver.

Sd/-

Presiding Officer.

[No. L-26012/5/74-LR-D. IV (B)]

BHUPENDRA NATH, Section Officer.